

THE  
**PANOPLIST,**  
AND  
**MISSIONARY MAGAZINE.**

---

No. 5.

MAY, 1816.

VOL. XII.

---

MISCELLANEOUS.

ON THE MANNER IN WHICH THE SCRIPTURES ARE TO BE UNDER-  
STOOD.

To the Editor of the Panoplist.

SIR,

THE world is in possession of very many, and those often very able, defences of Revelation; but I do not remember a single discussion of the question, *In what manner are the Scriptures to be understood?* The fact may, however, have been derived merely from my own ignorance, and the narrow limits of my reading. Should it be true, that the question has not been discussed, or that the discussion has been so remote in time, or place, as rarely, if at all, to have fallen into the hands of your readers; they will probably be pleased to find an examination of it in your useful Miscellany. The importance of the subject will not be doubted: for it is evidently of little use to us to know that a Revelation has been communicated to mankind, unless we also know what it is, that is revealed.

Should the following thoughts on this subject appear to you in any good measure satisfactory, or useful, you will please to give them a place in the Panoplist.

THERE are multitudes of persons in the Christian world, who, while they profess to believe the Scriptures, *deny* in some cases, and in others, *doubt*, the declarations, which they contain. But there are still greater multitudes, who professedly admit every thing, found in them; and who yet admit many of their declarations, *only in the sense, annexed by themselves* to the several passages, in which they are contained. Each of these has his own interpretation. In this manner the number of such interpretations has become very great; and, in very many instances, they are various, discordant, and contradictory. Hence, in the mind of a sober man, arises irresistibly the momentous question, "In what sense shall I believe this, and that, passage of Scripture? I am ready," such a man will say, "to admit without a question all the declarations of God. But how shall I understand their true meaning? I see multitudes differ widely on this subject; and among them many, who are ingenious, learned, and able. Whom shall I follow? or shall I follow none of them?"

This question is certainly rational, as well as important; and the perplexity, out of which it springs, ought as far as possible to be removed. The task I will now assume, and endeavor to perform.

VOL. XII.

To the question itself, then, I answer, that *the sense, in which the various declarations of God in the Scriptures are to be received by us, is the Obvious Sense; or that, which readily presents itself to a plain man, reading them with seriousness and integrity.*

In support of this answer, I adduce the following observations.

1. The Scriptures were almost universally addressed by those, who spoke, and wrote them, to persons of this class,

Moses wrote the Law for the people at large. This truth is declared in many forms. After God had pronounced the decalogue, the people, terrified by the awful splendors, which attended the promulgation of these commands, besought him, through the mediation of Moses, that they might hear his voice no more, lest they should die. God approved of their request; and commanded "Moses to teach them all the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which he should command him." Accordingly, "Moses called all Israel, and said unto them, 'Hear, O Israel, the statutes, and judgments, which I speak in your ears this day; that ye may learn them, and keep, and do them.'" "These words," said he again unto them, "which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart. Ye shall lay my words in your heart, and in your soul; and bind them for a sign upon your hand; that they may be as frontlets between your eyes: and ye shall teach them to your children; speaking of them, when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up; and thou shalt write them upon the door-posts of thine house." "In this manner every Israelite was required to educate his children in the knowledge of the law; and in this manner every Israelitish child was to be educated. The law, therefore, was, with absolute certainty, addressed to every Israelite.

When Joshua built an altar unto the Lord God in Mount Ebal, he read all the words of the law to the people. "There was not a word," it is subjoined, "of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua read not before all the Congregation of Israel, with the women, and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them." In the same manner Joshua addressed the words, which God commanded him, to all the tribes of Israel at Shechem. In the same manner a great part of the speeches, made by priests, prophets, and princes, in the Historical Books, were addressed to greater or less portions of the people at large.

The Psalms were not only written for the whole body of the people, but were made a part of their public worship.

The Book of Proverbs was written for the express purpose of "giving subtilty to the simple, and to the young man knowledge and discretion."

The Prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Zechariah, were addressed directly to the nation of the Jews; and those of Hosea, Amos, Micah, and Malachi, to the people of Israel.

Our Savior spoke almost every thing which he said, to the common people.



Matthew wrote his Gospel for the Hebrew Christians at large. Mark, Luke, and John, wrote their's for the Christian world at large. To the same persons were addressed the Acts of the Apostles. The Epistles of St. Paul, except those to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, were all written to the respective Churches, whose names they bear; Churches, consisting almost wholly of uneducated people. Those of Peter were addressed to a large body of people, of the same sort, in the Lesser Asia; and that of James, to the Christians among the Hellenistic Jews. The first Epistle of John, as it is commonly called, appears rather to be a Religious Essay, or Discussion, than a letter: but it is addressed generally to Christians at large; and particularly to Fathers, to old men, to young men, and to little children. The second was addressed to the elect Lady, and her children; that of Jude, to Christians at large; and the Apocalypse, to the Seven Churches of Asia.

I have gone through this detail with a particular design, that the whole subject might be before your readers; and that they might see the truth of the proposition, which we are considering, not in general, indeterminate expressions, but in the several particulars, of which it is made up. From these it appears, beyond all doubt, that the books, which I have specified, constituting the great body of both the Old and New Testaments, and containing all the Doctrines, found in the Canon, were addressed directly, and supremely, to that class of mankind, customarily designated by the phrases, the common people, and the people at large. From this fact, it follows irresistibly, that these parts of the Scriptures were written in language, which such people could understand; or, in other words, that the meaning of the language, actually used, is such, that those, to whom it was addressed, might, if seriously and honestly attentive, apprehend it without any considerable difficulty, or any danger of any material mistake. It cannot for a moment be admitted by common sense, or common decency, much less by a spirit of piety, that God has revealed his will to mankind, and yet that the language, in which the Revelation is made, is such, that those, to whom it is peculiarly addressed, should be unable to understand its meaning. It is presumed, that no sober man, addressing his fellow-men on any business of importance, ever used such words, as they could not interpret. Far less can it be believed, that Prophets of God, that the Savior, that his Apostles, or that any inspired man, disclosing to mankind the will of God concerning their salvation, should discourse to them in unintelligible phraseology; unintelligible, I mean, by *them*. If these writers, and speakers, have in fact used such language, it was certainly done by design; unhappily, not the design of men, but of the Spirit of inspiration. "For," says St. Paul, speaking of himself and his inspired brethren, "We speak not in the words, which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." The use of such language is only to perplex, and mislead; or, at the best, to communicate nothing to those, who hear. Can any sober man at-

tribute this conduct, or the design from which it must have sprung, to the Spirit of God?

But, if the language of the Scriptures was intended to be intelligible to those, to whom it was addressed, it was certainly uttered in the customary manner, and with its obvious meaning. The reason is plain, and decisive. These men could not possibly find out any other meaning nor understand it in any other manner. If, therefore, it was intended, that any other sense, than the obvious one, should be annexed to the words; whatever was addressed to them, was addressed to them in vain. Either they could not understand it at all; or they must understand it falsely, unless prevented by mere accident.

2. A great part of the Bible was written by men who knew no other than plain language, and no other meaning but that which was customary and familiar.

David, Amos, Matthew, Mark, John, Peter, James and Jude were uneducated men: and the same thing is probably true of several other writers in the sacred Canon. It is, however, sufficient for the present purpose, that these were of this character. All the essential doctrines, contained in the Scriptures, are, I think it may be safely asserted, found in the writers, mentioned under the former head. All these doctrines, therefore, were originally addressed to plain men. So many, at least, of these doctrines are delivered by the writers, mentioned under this head, that he, who cordially embraces what they have written, will find little difficulty in believing whatever is found in the Bible. But these men knew no language, beside the plain, familiar language of mankind. The knowledge of uncustomary, technical, or what may be called philosophical phraseology, is an attainment of mere learning; and cannot be possessed by an unlearned man. Hence a great part of the doctrines of the Gospel; so many as evidently to involve the whole; were certainly delivered in the plain language of men; because they were delivered by those, who knew no other.

Should it be said, that, although these men knew no other language by themselves, yet they may have received the knowledge of philosophical language by inspiration; since Christ promised them, that they should "receive a mouth, and speech, which all their adversaries should not be able to gainsay, or resist:" I answer, that St. Paul, in the passage, just now quoted from 1 Cor. ii, 13, expressly declares, that he, and his fellow apostles, did not use this language. "Which things also we speak, not in the words, which man's wisdom teacheth." The things, here mentioned, are in the preceding verse styled "the things, that are freely given to us of God;" and in the tenth verse, "the things which God hath revealed unto us by his Spirit:" i. e. the things, which are revealed to Paul, and to his fellow-apostles, by the Spirit of inspiration. These things, the Apostle declares, they did not speak in words, "taught by man's wisdom," or *human philosophy*. As this is true of the New Testament; so it is beyond all controversy equally true of the Old.



3. The Scriptures were written chiefly for plain men.

This I argue from three considerations.

The first is, that these constitute altogether the great body of mankind, and are immensely disproportioned in their numbers to all the rest. The souls of all these are, severally, of as much value, as those of the great and learned. From their numbers, therefore, it is reasonably concluded, that God in revealing his will, and publishing the way of salvation, had a primary reference to those, who were immeasurably more important to his eye than all others.

Secondly: The Scriptures directly exhibit this truth to us. St. James, censuring the particular respect, paid to the rich and great by the Christians, to whom he wrote, says, "Hearken, my beloved brethren; hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom?" Christ declared to the people of Nazareth by a quotation from the prophet Isaiah his own character, and mission, in these remarkable words; "*The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me: for he hath anointed me to preach the Gospel to the poor.*" When the Disciples of John came to inquire whether Jesus was the Messiah, or not; he gave it as one decisive proof of his character, that the poor had the Gospel preached to them. Almost all his labors were employed on plain, humble people. Such persons were his companions: such his Apostles.

Thirdly: Persons of this class have, much more extensively than any other, believed, and obeyed, the Scriptures. *The common people*, we are told, heard Christ gladly: and of them almost all his converts were made. Often they were his only defence against the malicious designs of their superiors. Several times, it is said, they would have laid hands on him; but did not, for fear of the people. The Apostles found the same defence: and almost all their converts were of the same class. What was true of those periods has been true of all, which have succeeded. From the remains of the early Fathers in the Church, particularly of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp, it is unanswerably evident, that they and the Christians, generally, of their time; Christians, distinguished for "*simplicity and godly sincerity*;" who "*had their conversation in the world, not by fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God*;" adopted no other mode of construing the Scriptures. These men were generally the plain inhabitants of the several countries, in which they lived, and by their piety, and benevolence, in life, and their meekness, patience, and fortitude, in death, proved to every succeeding age, that they were "precious sons of Zion, comparable to fine gold." Of the same character, were the great body of Christians in the second and third centuries; the numerous converts of Augustine; those of Bernard; the Waldenses; the Hussites; and the great body of converts, made at, and after, the Reformation. Generally, these have been almost all the Christians in every age of the Church.

But it is reasonably believed, that the Scriptures were especially written for those, who, it was foreseen, would embrace and obey them.

4. The doctrines, formed by the obvious meaning of the Scriptures, are the only doctrines, which have spread vital Religion in the world.

Those, who heard the Apostles preach, and their successors, through the two first centuries, and the earlier part of the third, were almost universally incapable of annexing any other meaning, than the obvious one, to the declarations of the Scriptures. This is the only character, given them both by their friends, and their enemies; and is, therefore, unquestionably their true character. It is hardly necessary to mention, because it is so well known, and so universally acknowledged, either the vast multitude of these Christians, or the pre-eminent excellence of their character. In the numerous instances, in which Religion prevailed in the succeeding ages of the Church, it prevailed solely by the preaching of the very same doctrines. This was true, particularly, with regard to the prevalence of religion in Egypt, under Dyonisius and Athanasius; in Africa, under Cyprian, Augustine, and Fulgentius; in Italy, under Ambrose; under the Gregories in the Lesser Asia; under St. Bernard, also, in France: and with regard to the numerous followers of Peter Waldo, and of John Huss; those of Wickliffe, also; and the very numerous Christians among the Reformed, in the various Protestant countries. To these may be added, the numerous Christians, found in this country, from its early settlement; and the vast multitude, which in many Protestant countries, between the years 1730 and 1760, became public professors of religion. Let any man employ himself in reading, diligently, Ecclesiastical History; particularly that branch of it, which records the prevalence of practical piety; and he will see irresistibly, that, when these doctrines have been preached, and believed, vital religion has flourished; when they have not, it has regularly decayed. Such has always been the fact heretofore: such is the fact at the present time.

If I am asked on what grounds I assert that the persons of whom I have spoken, were vitally religious; and that others were not; I answer, on that, which the Scriptures have made the evidence of vital religion: the conduct of the respective classes of men. "By their fruits" says our Savior, speaking of those who are not Christians, "shall ye know them." Those who have embraced these doctrines, have in a manner honorable to human nature, adorned the doctrine of God their Savior, by bringing forth those fruits, which he declares, spring from evangelical repentance, faith and holiness. Of this fact, as it respects the early ages of Christianity, there can be no debate; nor, it would seem, as it respects the Reformers, and their followers. There is little reason to doubt it, concerning the great body of Christians, who have followed them; even their enemies themselves being judges. Even by these, multitudes who hold the doctrines in question, are daily declared to be truly religious, and placed among the best of mankind. On this subject however, I cannot expatiate; but will conclude my observations concerning it, by a quotation, or two, from distinguished ad-



versaries of these doctrines. One of these, *Robert Forsyth, Esq.* a learned civilian, and a professed infidel, says, "There is one remark, which we think ourselves bound in justice to make, although it appears to us somewhat singular. It is this; that from the earliest ages down to our own days, if we consider the character of the ancient Stoics, the Jewish Essenes, the modern Calvinists, and Jansenists, when compared with that of their antagonists, the Epicureans, the Sadducees, the Arminians and the Jesuits; we shall find, that they have excelled in no small degree, in the practice of the most rigid and respectable virtues; and have been the highest honor of their own ages, and the best model for imitation to every age succeeding."

Dr. Priestley, also, acknowledges, that "those who hold these doctrines, have less apparent conformity to the world, and seem to have more of a real principle of religion," than his own followers; and that those who "from a principle of religion ascribe more to God, and less to man, than other persons" (the distinguishing characteristic of these men) "are men of the greatest elevation of piety." But if these doctrines have, and others have not, produced this mighty effect in the successive ages of the Church, it is, I think, clearly certain, that they are that truth of God, which, Christ declares, makes men free from the bondage of sin, and which St. Paul declares, is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." In other words, they are the genuine doctrines of the Gospel.

5. The Scriptures are actually written in such a manner, that their obvious meaning is the true meaning.

Every rhetorical critic, perplexed with no theological debates, and having no religious system to support, has remarked that the language of the Scriptures is distinguished from all other books by its simplicity; its native, uncontrived character; its accordance with the most artless speech of men. It would have been impossible for this opinion to have been universal, had it not been founded in fact. In perfect accordance with it, every man who reads the Scriptures without any particular design, and allows his own views and feelings to take their natural course, feels this truth irresistibly. Every such man feels that he has never met with any other writings, which were so remarkable for a manner so artless, and so purely natural. Particularly, every plain man here finds himself entirely at home; converses with those who speak in the manner to which he has been used from his infancy; and sees facts, doctrines and precepts presented to him with a plainness, which is elsewhere unrivalled. The Scriptures themselves long since declared this to be their true character. The wisdom of God, or, in other words, Christ, says, (Prov. viii, 8 and 9,) "All the words of my mouth are in righteousness: there is nothing froward or perverse in them. They are all plain to him that understandeth; and right to them that find knowledge:" i. e. There is nothing in my words, that is wreathed, or twisted; nothing perplexing: but all are plain to him, who possesses that understanding which consists in the fear of the

Lord. The prophet Isaiah says, that “when a king, (i. e. Christ) shall reign in righteousness, the eyes of them that see (i. e. of Christians, or pious men,) shall not be dim. The heart of the rash shall understand knowledge; and the tongue of the stammerers shall be ready to speak plainly.” In other words, Christians shall understand distinctly the things of religion; and those who before spoke of them indistinctly and obscurely, shall then be able to speak in a manner, clear and very intelligible.

The same prophet also says, that under the dispensation of the Gospel “the way of holiness shall be an highway; and that way-faring men, though fools, shall not err therein.” Of the same period he declares, that “the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun and the light of the sun seven-fold.” A multitude of other passages, of the same import, might easily be added to these, were it necessary. All plain Christians have in every age, and country, found these declarations completely verified in the satisfaction, comfort, peace and hope, which they have found in the invitations, and promises, in the direction of their duty furnished by the precepts, and in the enlargement of their religious knowledge, produced continually by the doctrines. These benefits are experienced, and declared, by those of the humblest character; even by children and servants; and it is remarkable, that those, who have found difficulties in such passages of Scripture, as especially direct the faith practice, and hopes, of mankind, have never found these difficulties in the want of an obvious meaning, but in their own unwillingness to receive that meaning, and in their wishes to find out some other which would better suit with own preconceived opinions.

To the observations under this head, two objections may not improbably be made. The first is; *that much of the Scriptural language is figurative, and therefore obscure.*

To this objection, I answer, that, although the language of the Scriptures is extensively figurative, it is not for that reason obscure. Figurative language, when used according to the dictates of nature, is scarcely at all less obvious, or less easily understood, than that, which is literal. Savages, and little children, use figurative language more than any other persons; and yet all, which they use, is perfectly understood by other savages, and other little children, to whom it is addressed. The figures, employed in the Scriptures, are those of mere nature; and are, therefore, generally at least, easily explained by the mind of every one, who knows the language of nature. The figurative phraseology in the Bible, which is obscure, is, ordinarily, not that, which the writers intended to use; but that which is made figurative by those, who comment on their writings.

It is ever to be remembered, that the figurative language of the Scriptures, though not uttered by children, nor savages, was formed by men in that state of society, which gives birth to the greatest simplicity of style. Accordingly, it has in every age been pronounced by men of all descriptions, who are acquainted with it, to be the strongest example of such simplicity, which is in our possession.



Every rhetorical writer, who has made the style of the Scriptures a subject of discussion, has passed upon it this sentence without even a qualification. This is so well known, that I should hardly be excused, should I attempt to prove it. Nor is there, within my knowledge, an exception to the remark, beside what is furnished by men, who take up the subject with an express intention to make it the means of weakening, or of overthrowing, some theological doctrine, or doctrines, and of establishing others. In this case, the opinions of any men are to be admitted with caution: since it is universally acknowledged, that persons so circumstanced will bend their judgment, and consequently pervert even the Scriptures themselves, under the strong biases, generated by the spirit of controversy. The sentence is not here a rhetorical, but a theological decision.

Whatever difficulties of this nature such men may find, or make, they are usually not found by *plain men*. The proof is complete. We hear no complaints on this subject from our own plain countrymen. I do not remember, that I ever heard a plain man object any obscurity to the Scriptures, certainly none of any serious importance, arising from their figurative phraseology. About the doctrines they find many difficulties; but none, which respect the figurative nature of the language.

The Scriptures have within a few years been very extensively distributed among heathen nations, particularly in Hindoostan. It is unnecessary to observe, that the people of that country are, as a body, much less enlightened than the plain people of this. Men, who are inquisitive concerning the progress of Christianity in the world, know, that missionaries, and others, have published numerous accounts concerning the manner, in which the Scriptures have been received, and understood, by the Hindoos. In these recitals, the difficulties, started up in the minds of that people by reading the Scriptures, have not been forgotten. I have read many of these reports, and do not remember among them all a single specimen of complaints concerning the obscurity of the Scriptural language, supposed to be derived from its figurative nature. Could this have happened, if difficulties of this kind were either numerous, or of serious importance?

Permit me also to observe, Mr. Editor, that those gentlemen, who say the most on this subject, do not in my view appear to feel all, which they express. The difficulties, of which they complain, spring, if I may credit their own accounts of them, much less from the figurative language of the passages, which they specify, than from the doctrines, which those passages seem obviously to express. Such passages, as they suppose obviously to favor the doctrines, embraced by themselves, are, I think, never mentioned by them as having their meaning obscured by figurative phraseology. Those on the contrary, which are considered as opposing their favorite doctrines, are universally, or very generally, mentioned by them as being not a little embarrassed by this phraseology. Here

the difficulty lies, plainly, not in the language, but in the doctrine, which it is supposed to contain.

To give an example, which must have often struck with no small force every reader of theological writings; whenever the Deity of Christ, or the Personality of the Holy Ghost, is apparently asserted in the Scriptures, however obvious, and literal, the assertions may seem, they are almost universally considered by several classes of writers as being strangely and perplexingly figurative. But can it be supposed, that any sober man of common sense, much more that the Spirit of God, should write, or dictate, in such a manner, as to be plain and obvious on all other subjects, and obscurely figurative, and perplexing, on these two, and such as are inseparably connected with them.

Secondly: It is objected, *that several subjects, and particularly doctrines, declared in them, are profound and mysterious; and demand the greatest human understanding to comprehend them.*

Concerning this objection I observe, that the doctrines and precepts, necessarily connected with salvation, are unattended with any difficulty, except what arises from our inclinations. Many doctrines, actually revealed, are inexplicable in their nature; and many others, in their antecedents, attendants, and consequents. They are connected with many things, with which their connection is inexplicable. In both cases we may find, or make, difficulties: but the difficulties do not arise, in the proper sense, from the Revelation, but from our curiosity. I will illustrate this assertion by an example. We are taught, that the soul will exist in a separate state. There is no difficulty in admitting the truth of this declaration; nor any want of evidence, that it is true; because it is a declaration of God. But if we suffer our curiosity to wander in a series of inquiries, in order to find out where, what, and how long; we may easily meet with so many, and so great difficulties, that we may be ultimately induced, as others probably have been, to reject the doctrine altogether. We are taught, that there will be a resurrection: and our understanding easily receives the instruction. But the single question, "Will the same body rise?" may easily involve us in a sufficient number of perplexities to cast extreme obscurity over the resurrection itself, and persuade us with Hymeneus and Philetus, to say that the resurrection is past already. All such difficulties arise, not from the thing revealed, but from the philosophical curiosity, with which it is investigated by ourselves. Let it ever be remembered, that the decisions, furnished by this investigation, are never matters of faith, and never obligatory upon the conscience; and that the investigation itself is very often perplexing as well as idle, and mischievous as well as useless. He who will be contented to take his Maker at his word, will rarely find himself embarrassed. But, in order to do this, he must be prepared to yield up every opinion of his own to the declarations of God.

To exhibit the justness of these views, I observe, that the religious part of the Christian church has adopted a single system of doc-



trines, from the Apostle's days to the present time. The observing reader of Ecclesiastical History, will find this truth irresistibly forced upon him, as his eye is passing through the annals of Christianity. The most remarkable example of it is presented to us by the *almost absolute harmony of the confessions, and creeds, adopted by the several Protestant countries*. Christians, therefore, have in every age and country found the language of the Scriptures sufficiently plain, and the meaning sufficiently obvious, to unite in the construction of the former, and the adoption of the latter. Nor have they felt any material embarrassment, either from the figurative nature of the phraseology, used by the writers, or the profoundness of the doctrines, which they have disclosed.

But the meaning, adopted by the great body of Christians in the several ages of the Church, is beyond all reasonable doubt the true meaning. It cannot be supposed, that God would leave his children, as a body, materially to mistake the meaning of his Word; nor cause his Word to be so written, that they would of course mistake the meaning in this manner, while reading it with diligence, integrity and reverence. But, if the obvious meaning be not the true one, both these suppositions must, so far as I can see, be admitted.

(To be continued.)

## REVIEW.

### XC. Pamphlets on the Unitarian Controversy.

(Concluded from page 178.)

THE only remaining grand topic, on which Mr. Channing dwells, for the purpose of substantiating the charge of falsehood, is expressed by him as follows: "The Review asserts, that these ministers and liberal Christians [i.e. the ministers of Boston and its vicinity and the great body of liberal Christians] are guilty of hypocritical concealment of their sentiments, and behave in a base, cowardly and hypocritical manner." p. 5. Now we have shown at large, under a preceding head, that we made no assertion at all, concerning the ministers of Boston generally, nor concerning the ministers of the vicinity generally, nor concerning the great body of liberal Christians. It did not then occur to us, that Mr. Channing had explained himself, on that subject, in his Remarks on Dr. Worcester's First Letter. His explanation is in these words: "It is true, that this passage may be understood as charging the Review with asserting, that *all the ministers of Boston of all denominations* are Unitarians of Mr. Belsham's school. I ought to have said, that the Review maintains—that the great body of liberal ministers in Boston and its vicinity, and of liberal Christians, are Unitarians, in Mr. Belsham's sense of the word." p. 5. And of course, Mr. Channing, after this explanation, is to be considered as having charged us with asserting, that "the great body of liberal minis-

ters in Boston and its vicinity, and of liberal Christians, are guilty of hypocritical concealment of their sentiments, and behave in a base, cowardly and hypocritical manner." No such assertion was ever made by us. We made no sweeping declaration concerning 'the great body of liberal ministers in Boston and its vicinity.' We never mentioned the great body of liberal Christians. We animadverted, indeed, with some severity, on the concealment, which had been practised by the *leading Unitarians* in this country; that is, by a *majority* of these leading Unitarians; and from the representations of Mr. Belsham, Dr. Freeman, and Mr. Wells, we censured what these three gentlemen evidently considered as a temporizing policy. We supposed the number of leading Unitarians to be not very large; and as to the great body of liberal Christians, or even the great body of the liberal party in Massachusetts, there in nothing said in our Review, which can be tortured into a charge of concealment, or hypocrisy, on their part. In short, nothing is said about them, in reference to the subject of concealment or hypocrisy. So grossly inaccurate was Mr. Channing, even after the errors of his Letter had been exposed. His inaccuracy unfortunately happens to be of a very mischievous kind; for many of his readers would suppose, if they relied upon his statement, that we had called them artful hypocrites, and would be highly exasperated, not only against us, but against Dr. Worcester and all who think as we do; when in fact we had said nothing about them, and had not even alluded to them in terms of reprehension. We therefore propose to Mr. Channing and his advocates the following question, which they are requested to ponder and answer at their leisure: In what page or pages of our Review do we assert, that "the great body of liberal Christians are guilty of hypocritical concealment of their sentiments, and behave in a base, cowardly and hypocritical manner?" If they cannot find any thing, (as they most assuredly cannot,) which bears even a remote likeness to this statement, let them confess that the charge is altogether unfounded; and let Mr. Channing, before he attempts to write controversy again, learn to state things as they are.

We will now repeat in substance what we *did* say, on the topic under consideration.

1. We represented the 'defection from orthodoxy,' in Boston and the vicinity, as having 'extended itself *silently and covertly*.' p. 241. This is undeniably true, and is warranted by the testimony of Dr. Freeman.

2. We declared it to be an 'artifice practised systematically by a *majority* of the clergymen, *who have led the way* in this apostasy, to inculcate the opinion, that they *did not differ materially* from their clerical brethren throughout the country.' p. 242. This is notoriously the fact. We produced a case to the purpose, and related several circumstances of it particularly, as an example of what has often taken place. It is remarkable, that though Mr. C. does not deny that these circumstances were related with perfect accuracy; though he probably knows that they were thus re-



lated; he is notwithstanding in very ill humor with us, for having produced a fact to verify our assertion. This is hard indeed. If we make any serious allegation against the liberal party, and do not produce some evidence in support of it, the truth of the allegation is vehemently denied. If, foreseeing this result, we bring forward the declarations of leading members of the liberal party; declarations made with great earnestness, and on a public occasion; we are accused of the "degrading practice of publishing what people say."\* Thus, when we charged the liberal party with having patronized and circulated the Improved Version, the charge was very angrily repelled. We immediately produced a variety of facts, completely sufficient, in our opinion, to support the charge. The facts were not, and could not be, denied. They came into our possession unsought. And yet for stating incontrovertible facts, to refute a vehement charge of falsehood and calumny, we were attacked with nothing but sneers. We were represented as going about for the purpose of collecting *gossiping stories*. This disingenuous example Mr. C. has been willing to imitate.

We could state several facts in support of what we alleged as to the *artifice*, which has been practised. We will state *one*. Mr. Channing may call it a "story," if he pleases; it is at any rate the truth. When Mr. Codman was persecuted, because he would not pledge himself to exchange ministerial labors with certain members of the liberal party, it was a common saying in that party, that he was not authorized to suppose there was any great difference of opinion between him and his clerical neighbors; and that they all preached "those great truths and precepts," (to use the words of Mr. C.) "about which there is little contention."

If it should be said, that our crime lies in calling this conduct by the name of *artifice*, when it is no more than a charitable opinion respecting the differences among professed Christians; and when those, who express such an opinion, do in fact honestly think the differences between them and the orthodox to be comparatively unimportant; we answer: First; the declaration, that the persons in question *do not differ materially* from the orthodox, produces a very different effect from that which would be produced by a frank and full statement of the points of difference. This the liberal party know perfectly well. Hence their attachment to general and ambiguous terms. Secondly; these very persons show, in many instances, that they themselves think these differences to be vastly important. Thirdly; whenever the liberal party, in this or any other country, have deemed it expedient or necessary to avow their opinions openly, they insist strenuously on the amazing value of their improvements in theology. We feel justified, therefore, in having used the word *artifice*.

3. We gave it as our judgment, that the conduct of the congregation at the Stone Chapel, "and of their minister, in coming out openly, and avowing their sentiments to the world, is vastly prefer-

\*Mr. Channing's Letter. p. 36.

able to a hypocritical concealment of them." p. 251. We then intimated, that 'other societies had not followed their example,' That we were right in this intimation Mr. Wells plainly testifies.

4. We said, that Mr. Belsham's object, in publishing a certain letter, "was, doubtless, to chastise the Boston clergy for their cowardice in concealing their religious opinions." p. 260. That such was Mr. Belsham's object, no person who reads that letter, and Mr. Belsham's remarks upon it, can doubt for a moment. If we have been correctly informed, some of the Boston clergy felt this chastisement very keenly before our Review was written.

5. We intimated, that those 'advocates of Socinianism, who had clandestinely crept into orthodox churches, by forbearing to contradict the faith of these churches, and had then moulded their hearers by negative preaching,' were chargeable with 'cunning and policy;' that the apostles did not act thus; and that such conduct is "base and hypocritical," and "common honesty revolts at it." p. 260. The only question here must be, whether there have been any advocates of Socinianism, who have crept into orthodox churches in the manner here described. If there have been, we contend that the language, which we used, is not unwarrantably severe. In that case, we have nothing to retract, nor to repent of. We frankly avow, that we believe there have been such persons. Our proofs shall appear presently.

6. We said, "the idea that a minister believes the truths of the Gospel to be of infinite importance, and still conceals them, is incompatible either with fidelity or integrity." p. 261. This was a general observation, for the correctness of which we appeal to the consciences of Unitarians themselves.

We are not backward to admit, that the passages, to which we have now referred, contain language of strong censure and severe reprehension. Let us look a little at the documents which called forth this reprehension.

Dr. Freeman, after stating in his letter to Mr. Lindsey, that 'the Unitarian doctrine was upon the increase,' and that 'he was acquainted with a number of ministers, who avowed and publicly preached it,' goes on to say; "There are others *more cautious*, who content themselves with *leading their hearers*, by a course of rational but prudent sermons, *gradually and insensibly* to embrace it. Though this latter mode is not what I entirely approve, yet it produces good effects. For the people are thus kept out of the reach of false opinions, and are *prepared* for the impressions which will be made on them by more *bold and ardent* successors, when these *timid characters* are removed off the stage." This passage we quoted, at p. 252. Does it not plainly charge "these *timid characters*" with concealment of their opinions? We gave great offence by saying, that "many well-meaning people were *led in the dark*." What says Dr. F. about certain '*more cautious* ministers, who contented themselves with *leading their hearers gradually and insensibly* to embrace Unitarianism?' These cautious men were expressly distinguished by him from others, 'who *avowed and publicly*



preached' their sentiments. It appears, too, that Dr. Freeman's conscience could not approve of the conduct which he describes. Though these men were his friends; though they were embarked in the same cause with himself, and were really promoting that cause; yet he could not help seeing the obliquity of the path, in which they were travelling. In short, Dr. F. represents them as being essentially different from what their hearers supposed them to be; as being themselves conscious of this difference; as operating secretly, by keeping what he calls "false opinions" from the people of their charge; and as being induced to conceal their opinions by *timidity*. If Mr. Channing thinks such conduct fair, open, and honorable, we must be excused for forming and expressing a very different judgment.

Let us now look at Mr. Wells's letter, with a particular reference to the subject of concealment. Of Unitarianism, this gentleman declares, that while 'its tenets have spread very extensively in New England, he believes there is only one church *professedly* Unitarian.' What a picture is here! A sect has prevailed *very extensively* in a great country; and yet it comprises but a single congregation of persons, who make an *open profession* of their doctrines. Volumes could not say more. Mr. Channing contends, that Mr. Wells used the word Unitarian in its largest sense, as comprising all who are not Trinitarians; and Mr. Wells assures us, that such was the fact. Of course, Mr. Wells here testifies most explicitly, that but one congregation in New-England was *professedly* Anti-trinitarian; although the sect had prevailed very extensively, and although, as he immediately afterwards informs Mr. Belsham, 'most of the Boston clergy and respectable laymen are Unitarian,' i. e. Anti-trinitarian. Was there ever a system of concealment more perfect, and more universal than this?

Again; Mr. Wells declares, that 'most of the Boston clergy, and respectable laymen, do not think it *at all necessary* to conceal their sentiments on these subjects, but express them without the least hesitation, *when they judge it proper*.' We remark here, that Mr. Wells is obviously desirous of giving his correspondent a just view of the state of Unitarianism in this country. He is communicating information; he is *telling news*. His very declaration, that the Unitarians, clergy and laity, did not think it necessary to conceal their sentiments, imports either that they *had* thought it necessary, or that Mr. Belsham *supposed* they had. We believe it imports both; for if the Unitarians had *never* thought it necessary to conceal their sentiments, why does Mr. Wells use the present tense? Who ever thought, by the way, of saying that the orthodox do not think it necessary to *conceal* their sentiments? Who ever supposed they did? Whether in a majority or a minority, whether enjoying religious liberty or suffering under persecution, they have never thought it necessary to conceal their sentiments; but they *have* thought it necessary to avow, to preach, and to defend, their sentiments, as the truth of God, under every species of obloquy and persecution, and at the hazard of their reputation, their personal

comfort, and their lives. We submit it to the reader, whether Mr. Wells's expression does not imply further, that the Unitarians *would* conceal their sentiments, if they thought it at all necessary. But these gentlemen 'express their sentiments without the least hesitation!' When? Indeed, when should they, but—"WHEN THEY JUDGE IT PROPER?" Very well. But when *do* they judge it proper? Do these Boston clergy, of whom Mr. Wells speaks, *judge it proper* to express their sentiments, on the amazingly important subject of the Trinity, from the pulpit? Not they, if Mr. Wells is to be believed. We speak of the time when Mr. W.'s letter was written; i. e. March, 1812; for he expressly states, that, excepting the Chapel, "the controversy is seldom or *never* introduced into the pulpit." Will it be said, that Mr. Wells means only, that Unitarianism was not discussed in the pulpit in a controversial manner? We reply, that he must have meant more than this, for he afterwards says, that "the majority of those who are Unitarian are perhaps of these sentiments, without any *distinct consciousness* of being so." Of course, this majority of Unitarians never heard any thing about the subject, certainly nothing clear and distinct on it, from the pulpit. We think the inference altogether inevitable. People have usually thought, that the pulpit is the place, whence a minister's religious doctrines are to be learned; and the thought is not unnatural. It is generally taken for granted, that the apostles declared "all the counsel of God," in their public preaching. But in these days of improvement, a considerable number of clergymen abstain utterly from introducing into the pulpit a subject, which, as all admit, forms a most important part of the Christian scheme. Do these Unitarians *judge it proper* to disclose their sentiments through the medium of the press? Not under their own names. Mr. Wells says, "if publications make their appearance attacking Unitarian sentiments, they are commonly answered with spirit and ability." But the answers here referred to have always appeared either in the Anthology, or the Repository; and if any charge is brought against the liberal party, on account of pieces contained in these works, the very preferring of such a charge is resented as a high indignity; and the Anthology and Repository are laid aside with as little ceremony, as though they were bundles of old almanacs. If we express a conviction, that a particular paper was written by a certain individual, although it was notoriously and undeniably written by him, yet the very suggestion of such a thing is treated as though it were a slander cast upon the writer. Truly the liberal party must acquire more courage, or they can never expect to be acknowledged as the open, frank, and prosperous sect, which some of their late writings would persuade us that they are. They must learn not to be ashamed of their own works, the first moment these works are laid to their charge. In reference to the concealment, which has been practised, Mr. Wells says, "This state of things appears *so favorable* to the dissemination of correct sentiments, that I should perhaps regret a great degree of excitement in the public mind upon these subjects." We believe that



Mr. Wells and his party have judged very correctly, in supposing 'such a state of things' to be 'favorable to the dissemination' of their sentiments. This concealment will be less easily practised hereafter. The public will see what the event will be.

We shall dismiss the subject of concealment by a hasty reference to Mr. Belsham. This gentleman, the historian of Unitarianism in New England, the correspondent and friend of many individuals of the liberal party in Boston, evidently took it for granted, that a system of concealment prevailed in that party; a concealment which disguised itself under the plausible names of prudence, candor, and a love of peace, but which appeared to him nothing better than a cowardly abandonment of the truth, the result of a miserable time-serving policy. This was Mr. Belsham's view of the matter; and it must be confessed, that he had some opportunities of coming at the true state of the case. In giving the account of Mr. Sherman's dismissal, he animadverts, in strong terms, on the inconsistency of the *prudent* council, as he ironically terms it. For this account we refer the reader to p. 264, in our Review. In his reflections on Mr. Abbot's dismissal, Mr. Belsham is still more severe. "Thus again," says he, "we see the sacred cause of Christian truth, sacrificed to a *mean* and *temporizing* policy; and the faithful champion of truth, the amiable, useful, and beloved pastor, torn from his weeping flock, and consigned to poverty and solitude, for the sake of preserving a *hollow, deceitful*, temporary peace. But this cannot last long; nor can such a measure be approved by the great Head of the church." Let the liberal party look well to this piece of Unitarian history. Let them consider, that the council here described was a *liberal* council, and that their conduct is thus stigmatized by a liberal historian. What did this council sacrifice? "The sacred cause of Christian truth." To what did they sacrifice it? "To a *MEAN* and *TEMPORIZING* policy." What else did they sacrifice? "The faithful champion of truth." From what motives? "For the sake of preserving a *hollow, deceitful*, temporary peace." How does God regard such a proceeding? It cannot "be approved by the great Head of the church." Who says all this? Not the Panoplist Reviewer, but Mr. Belsham. Let our readers weigh the condemnation here pronounced, and judge whether it is not heavier than any which our Review contained.

Again; Mr. Belsham, in his comments on a letter which he had received from this country, goes upon the presumption, that concealment was systematically practised by the Boston clergy. He admits, that it cannot be expected, "upon the common principles of human nature," that 'a body of clergy, nursed in the lap of ease and affluence,' should make "an open profession of unpopular truth." "Yet still," says he, "it cannot reasonably be hoped, that truth will make any visible and rapid progress, till her advocates rise above the *fear of man*, and the *love of ease*, and are willing, with the apostles of Christ, and the reformers of every age, to forsake all and to sacrifice their dearest interests in her glorious cause." Mr. B. supposes himself to differ from his Boston friends, not only



in reference to the question of duty, but on the score of policy also. He thinks, that the open preaching of Unitarianism would accelerate its progress wonderfully. Mr. Wells thinks otherwise; and we are altogether of Mr. Wells's opinion. We therefore think it a point of immense importance, an acquisition of very great value, that many members of the liberal party have been driven from their concealment, and compelled to avow their sentiments. So far as our Review has been instrumental in producing this result, we have great reason to congratulate ourselves.

It is curious to observe how cautious Mr. Channing is not to offend Mr. Belsham by finding any fault with his representations. A book may be published throughout Great Britain, and parts of it may be reprinted and circulated throughout this country, which parts contain severe animadversions on the Unitarians among us; and yet all this is received with the most exemplary meekness, and without a word of contradiction or complaint. The writer may go on to accuse prominent men in the party of pursuing a *mean* and *temporizing* policy, and to bestow upon them a variety of indignant and reproachful epithets. All this he may do as a friend, and through anxiety for the cause in which he and they are embarked. But when *we* simply repeat his charges, and rely upon the accuracy of his representations, though they generally correspond with all our own knowledge on the subject, we are assailed in the most violent manner, as the basest of slanderers. In regard to the charge of concealment and hypocrisy, let Mr. Channing settle his accounts with Dr. Freeman, Mr. Wells, and Mr. Belsham; let him come forward to the public, and not fear to repeat the words from the mouths of these gentlemen; let him take paragraph by paragraph, and sentence by sentence, and show, if he can, that these three witnesses prove the liberal party to be frank, open, bold, and conscientious, in the public avowal of their sentiments; and then, but not till then, let him complain of our statements.

Thus have we examined all the most important charges, which Mr. Channing brought against us. We have stated the true meaning of the offensive passages in our Review, and that meaning we have felt both able and willing to defend. As a strong confirmation of the positions which we have taken, it may be mentioned, that Dr. Worcester and the Reviewer in the Vermont Adviser, each examining the subject for himself, came to the same result, and completely vindicated our Review from the charge of falsehood and misrepresentation.

We now proceed to examine the controversy between Mr. Channing and Dr. Worcester. It may appear to some of our readers, that we have occupied too many pages with an exposure of Mr. Channing's unadvised and unfounded charges against us. But we ask them to consider, whether something was not due to our own character, thus violently assailed by a clergyman of high standing in his party, a man who had no small share of reputation depending on the validity of his accusations. We are sanguine enough to suppose, also, that the further disclosure of the views, designs, and



character of the liberal party, which the present article has already made, will not be useless; and that candid men cannot help perceiving, that all our disclosures concerning this party have been made with caution, deliberation, and a sacred regard to truth. Our friends will also remember, that when a complete answer is attempted, it should be really what it professes to be, and not a hurried discussion; and that false charges may be made in half a page, or even in half a sentence, which it must take many pages to refute particularly and effectually. Should a similar attack be made upon the Panoplist hereafter, it is probable that a very brief notice of it will be sufficient.

The calm and dispassionate manner, in which Dr. Worcester examines the charge of concealment, is truly admirable, and must have been prodigiously mortifying to Mr. C. and his liberal friends. Our readers shall be favored with the following specimen.

"It does, however, appear to me very clear, that Dr. Freeman, Mr. Wells, and Mr. Belsham did suppose, and that in the documents on which the Reviewer principally relies as his vouchers, they do represent, that liberal ministers, and other liberal gentlemen have judged it proper, not to make ordinarily a free and full disclosure of their sentiments: that they have in fact thought it expedient to temporize. Whether, in this opinion of you and your brethren, those gentlemen are correct or not, you must have been apprised, that the opinion is not peculiar to them, but very extensively prevalent: prevalent, not among those only, whom you would consider your adversaries, but also among your friends. Hundreds and hundreds of times have I heard it uttered from various quarters, with various expressions of approbation and disapprobation; and never, in any debate or conversation, as I recollect, have I heard the truth of it denied, or called in question. It seems indeed to have been received as an established, uncontested fact, that ministers of the liberal class were not accustomed to be unreserved and explicit in the public avowal and declaration of their sentiments. I confess to you, Sir, that I had so received it; nor did I ever imagine that in so receiving it, there was any thing injurious or uncharitable: for I did suppose that you and your liberal brethren held it as a maxim, founded upon reasons satisfactory to your own minds, that a degree of reserve and concealment, greater or less according to circumstances, was prudent, and justifiable, and praiseworthy. In this supposition I have been from time to time strengthened, by conversations with respectable individuals of the class, and not a little confirmed by what I have occasionally heard from the pulpit. I have now in very fresh remembrance some sentiments to this effect, delivered in a sermon which I heard at an ordination in Boston a few months ago; and in which the preacher very distinctly, and with considerable amplification, held forth that, though in some places it might be well, and "contribute to the faith and virtue of the people," for a minister openly and plainly to declare his sentiments, yet in other places it would not be prudent or proper; and in regard to this, the gentleman then ordained was affectionately and earnestly advised to regulate himself, according to the habits of thinking and feeling, the prejudices or freedom from prejudice, which he should find to prevail among his people." pp. 17, 18.

Dr. W. then expresses his surprise at Mr. Channing's denial of concealment, on the part of himself and his brethren. This denial, however, is accounted for, on the assumption of Mr. C. that he and his friends 'perpetually urge those great truths and precepts about



which there is little contention; while, as Dr. W. alleges, 'they studiously refrain from encountering the opinions of any of the various denominations of Christians, who differ from them.' Dr. W. then urges, with irresistible force, that according to Mr. Channing's own account of the matter, the liberal clergy abstain from expressing their opinions on 'any of the primary, any of the peculiar doctrines and institutions of the Gospel.' This is enough to settle the question of concealment finally and forever.

Mr. C. had said, "to believe with Mr. Belsham is no crime;" and yet Mr. C. admits Mr. Belsham to be in great errors. Further, Mr. C. has said, in a printed sermon, that 'he was unwilling to believe that infidelity can never be traced to causes, which may absolve it from guilt.' In other words, infidelity may be perfectly innocent. Dr. W. appeals to Scripture on this subject; and we need not say, that Mr. C.'s position must instantly fall under severe condemnation, if Scripture is permitted to decide. Dr. W. then urges the practice of the apostles, and the estimation in which they held religious error, as being totally different from the system recommended by the liberal party and their champion.

The third topic of Mr. Channing's letter is occupied with the subject of the *separation*, which we had pressed upon the orthodox. We have not been willing to consider this topic as belonging exclusively to ourselves; and have purposely left it to be discussed as a part of the more general controversy. Mr. Channing says, indeed, referring to our Review, that he believes "this is the first instance, in which Christians have been deliberately called to deny us [the Unitarians] the Christian name and privileges." It has been an involuntary exclamation, when this passage has been read by persons at a distance, "Mr. Channing must be a very ignorant man!" We answer, not so ignorant as he is passionate and unguarded. It does truly evince a most deplorable inattention to what is taking place, and has always been taking place since the Christian era, to say, that the name and privileges of Christians have never been denied to Unitarians of any class, till our Review set the example. Perhaps Mr. C. would confine his assertion to this country. Very well. Let him look at this country. Several years ago, the General Association of Connecticut, a body which represents all the congregational clergy in that state, resolved, that no clergyman ought to exchange ministerial labors with any man, claiming to be a Christian minister, if he denied the Divinity of Christ. Did not the Anthology complain of this decision? But Mr. C. did not read the Anthology. Again; the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States resolved, two or three years ago, that baptism, administered by a Socinian, was null and void; and the resolution was taken, as a practical consequence of the opinion, that heretics of this class are not to be received as Christians. Was not this decision loudly complained of by the Boston clergy? and was not Mr. C. one of the complainers? It is beyond question the fact, that the orthodox generally do consider many of the clergy, who are members of the liberal party, as



exerting an influence hostile to Christianity; as leading their hearers away from the truth; as depriving the pious of the great sources of gratitude and consolation, and imparting a vain confidence and presumption to careless sinners. That all the members of the party, and all who are claimed as belonging to it, exert precisely the same kind of influence, nobody supposes; but that the general influence of the party is of the unhappy and mischievous character just described must certainly be admitted, if the doctrines of the Reformation are the doctrines of the Bible. The orthodox have examined the Scriptures for themselves, as we presume they have a right to do; and they are unwilling to give up the plain declarations of the word of God, the testimony of their own consciences, and the result of all their observation and experience, on the lofty assumptions of any set of men. They conceive the doctrines of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the entire depravity of man, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, the absolute and universal government of God, justification by faith alone, the unalterable state of the righteous and the wicked in the world to come, and many other doctrines connected with these, to be clearly taught in the Bible. They conceive, also, that these doctrines derive every possible confirmation and support from the history of the church and the world, and from all that takes place within and around them. Thus conceiving, they cannot but regard the subverters of these doctrines as the subverters of the Gospel, and the promulgators of another Gospel, which, being essentially different from the true in all its fundamental articles, is not to be received as the Gospel of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Mr. Channing seems not to know how to discuss the question of separation on its merits; but resorts instantly to those topics, which are calculated to awaken the passions of his friends and admirers. There is scarcely an attempt at argument, if we except a quotation from Dr. Campbell on Heresy, a passage of which the liberal party are immoderately fond. It seems to contain the sum total of their learning, and their reasoning, on this subject. They have published it, in substance at least, several times. They may rest assured, however, that Dr. Campbell's decision is not calculated to terrify any man, who can read the New Testament, and think for himself. So far as it clashes with the practice of the orthodox, or with the course recommended in our Review, it can be easily refuted. We have no room to examine it here, but may take up the subject on some future occasion.

Dr. Worcester discusses the call for separation with distinguished ability.

"It is to be lamented," says he, "that on a subject of this serious and momentous kind, you should have thought it proper so entirely to dispense with argument, and with all the scriptural considerations which, in relation to this subject, so forcibly press themselves upon the conscience and the heart; and to indulge so freely in vague declamation, poignant invective, and fervid appeal to popular prejudices and passions. I know full well, and too many know, that this is the way to strike the minds of that great majority of mankind, to whom thought and reflection are irksome; the method best adapted for the support



of a bad cause. I am fully aware of your advantages in this respect. But, Sir, a minister of Jesus Christ should esteem it a higher honor and a nobler achievement, to enlighten the understanding and correct the conscience of a single individual, than to rouse the passions and inflame the prejudices of thousands.—Declamation is always, for a very obvious reason, difficult to answer. Yours however, under the present head, is evidently bottomed on several *assumptions*, which I deem utterly inadmissible, and some of the principal of which I propose to consider." pp. 26, 27.

The first assumption considered by Dr. W. is this: "That the points of doctrine, upon which Mr. C. and his liberal brethren differ from their opponents, are comparatively small and trivial; not *practical*, but speculative merely, and such as do not materially affect Christian character." This assumption is shewn to be utterly unfounded. The creed of the higher classes of Unitarians is briefly compared with that of the orthodox, and proved to be fundamentally different; and the difference clearly appears to be much of a practical nature. The scheme of Mr. Belsham is then considered; for Mr. Channing had pleaded for Mr. Belsham with no less confidence than for himself. This scheme is represented as "another Gospel" than that, which Paul preached; or at any rate, as a diverse Gospel from that which the orthodox receive. If one be true, the other must be false; so that there can be no foundation for communion between the adherents to these totally different systems.

The second assumption, which Dr. Worcester examines, is, "That every separation between professed Christians is unjustifiable; a criminal *schism*, the guilt of which is chargeable upon those who insist upon it as requisite." p. 29. The nature of schism is here inquired into; and the discussion of this topic closes with the two following paragraphs.

"How, indeed, is the fellowship for which you plead to be maintained? Upon this point you and your liberal brethren have taken care that we should be pretty fully informed. The orthodox churches must give up their creeds and covenants, their Psalms and Hymns and Doxologies; must cease to insist on, as important, the great doctrines which they now hold to be fundamental and essential to the Christian faith; must exclude from their pulpits all mysterious and controverted doctrines,—all that are not included in what is fashionably called liberal or rational Christianity; must consent in a word, to have their preaching and worship conducted on such principles, and in such a manner, as will not disturb the minds of liberal Christians, or Unitarians of any class!—Is not this, Sir, precisely the way most distinctly marked out, and most strenuously insisted on, in your periodical publications, in your ordination sermons, and in all your discourses and conversations on this subject? If the orthodox ministers and churches will only consent to all this, the thing is done; all will be love, and peace, and fellowship. That is, if they will consent to yield up as unscriptural or unimportant the doctrines of faith and the principles of worship, which they now hold most essential to Christian character, devotion, and practice,—to hold it "no crime to believe as Mr. Belsham believes," and, to worship as he worships; and thus cease to be orthodox, or in any respect materially different from those called liberal Christians; all the difficulty will be removed, and the way will be open and easy for an established and permanent fellowship between them and Unitarians of all degrees.—Yes, Sir: and if Unitarians would cease to be Unitarians, and become orthodox Christians, the way would be equally unobstructed.



"But here lies the difficulty. The orthodox ministers and churches will not consent thus to yield up their faith and their worship: and from the earnest and abundant labor and pains which you and your liberal brethren have employed, to bring them to these terms, it is manifest that, unless they will consent, you do not yourselves suppose there can be fellowship between you and them. Because they do not consent, you continually charge them with being bigoted, illiberal, uncharitable; and now seem disposed to charge them even with schism and heresy. But, Sir, if on account of their steadfast adherence to their faith and worship a separation and non-fellowship ensue, does it not deeply concern you, as well as them, very seriously to consider on which side the guilt will lie? Unquestionably, notwithstanding any thing which you have said of your own, or quoted from Dr. Campbell, it must lie on that side, which the Redeemer and King of Zion shall judge to have removed itself from the foundation of the apostles and prophets." pp. 30, 31.

The sentence, with which this passage concludes, is well worthy of being considered by Mr. C. and by all latitudinarians. The question, "What is schism?" will be decided, not by a majority of votes; not by men of any class or character; particularly not by men, who rely on their own reason as sufficient to direct them in the way to heaven, and who seem to take great credit to themselves for kindness, when they make the path of life so broad, that nearly all may fancy themselves travelling in it: but this momentous question will be decided, according to the immutable word of God, without giving up one iota to the plausible declamation, or earnest wishes, of self-deceivers. How idle, then, is it, how arrogant, how presumptuous, to attempt to settle such a question, by a clamorous appeal to the expectations and hopes, the wishes and prejudices, of a narrow circle of persons, who may choose to call themselves liberal and enlightened. The only rational and scriptural way of examining any subject, which relates to the great doctrines and duties of the Bible, is by a sober appeal to the Bible itself. We admire a passage quoted from Kirwan's Sermons, in the review of that work by the Christian Observer. "But in the midst of this scene of continual revolution, the Scriptures remain unchangeable as the Source from which they sprung. Such as the first Christians received and understood them, such are they at this hour; and such will they be when the heavens and the earth have passed away. Neither the force nor corruption of times can render them more austere or more indulgent."

The last assumption, which Dr W. takes up, is this: "That it can be only from a bigoted, uncharitable, and malignant spirit,—a "proud, censorious, and overbearing temper," that a separation can be proposed." p. 31. Here Dr. W. remarks, that Mr. C. is directly at variance with Mr. Belsham and others of the same party, who loudly demand a separation. He then exposes the abuse of the word charity, the sophistry to which this abuse leads, and advances to this question: "Would it conduce more to the promotion of truth for the believers in the true Gospel to hold fellowship with the believers in another Gospel, than to separate from them?" It will not be easy for Mr. C. or any other man to answer the reasoning on this topic. If an answer should be attempted, we recommend that the first point to be established should be this: That it is impossible

for any man who *says* he is a Christian, and appears to lead a moral life, to embrace fundamental errors. When this point shall be clearly established, it will follow, that a large part of the New Testament is unmeaning, unreasonable, and of no authority whatever. At this stage, in the course of their descent, Mr. Belsham and his particular friends have long since arrived. When the New Testament is arraigned, tried, condemned, and rejected by such men, they may easily imagine themselves to have proved any thing, which may be flattering to their pride, or grateful to their feelings.

Dr. W. closes the discussion of this topic with the following pathetic expressions.

"In the mean time, Charity, heaven-born Charity, must be allowed to weep and lament over the inroads of error and the desolations of Zion. Yes, Sir, charmed not at all with the so loudly chaunted praises of increased "light,"—abashed not at all by the disdainful sneers at imputed fanaticism,—she will weep—that her adored Lord is denied his divine honors, in the beloved city of our solemnities, where our fathers saw his glory, and delighted to celebrate his wonderful works of love and mercy." p. 35.

Mr. Channing did not think it proper to be silent on the appearance of Dr. Worcester's First Letter. The flame, which his own letter to Mr. Thacher had kindled, was deadened, if not entirely quenched, by the flood of reasoning and eloquence so readily poured forth. It would not do to be silent. Something must be said. But we think most attentive readers will be convinced, that Mr. C. began his Remarks with a mortifying consciousness of inferiority to his opponent; a consciousness, which no reasonable man will condemn him for feeling. As he advances in his discussion, he writes with fluency and animation, though with a most deplorable deficiency of argument. Not one of the great points of Dr. Worcester's Letter is taken up carefully, and examined leisurely, and with a view to produce conviction. The utmost that Mr. C. appears to have aimed at, was, to escape without disgrace from the contest. Two apologies may be made for him. One is, that Dr. Worcester's Letter could not be answered, as such a production should be, (even on the supposition that its main positions were capable of being answered,) in a hasty pamphlet, designed to make a popular impression. The other is, that Mr. C. is most eminently unfitted to become a controversial writer. He wants the patience, the accuracy, the coolness, the sagacity, the powers of discrimination, which are indispensable to the able management of a controversy. On this subject, we suppose there is but one opinion, among those who are qualified to judge, whether friends or opposers.

The great points of Dr. W.'s Letter were, as our readers have seen, a vindication of our Review from the charge of falsehood; an examination of Mr. C.'s declaration, that to believe in error is no crime; an exposure of the concealment practised by the liberal party; and a detection of the various assumptions, which had afforded Mr. C. topics of such fervid declamation. As to the vindication of our Review, Mr. C. confesses that he had fallen into a slight inaccura-



cy; but repeats substantially the same charges as before; charges which we have shewn to be unfounded. In one thing we cordially unite with him; that is, in referring the reader to the Review itself. As to the other points, not one of them is fairly met. We will give a few specimens of Mr. C.'s entire failure, to say the least, on subjects of very great consequence. Dr. Worcester inquires,

"Is not Mr. Belsham's Gospel, as set forth in his creed, *another Gospel*, than that which Paul preached? If you are not willing to admit this; yet surely you cannot hesitate a moment to admit, that it is another, than that which is held by orthodox Christians,—which is preached by orthodox ministers:—essentially different in every particular from the foundation to the top stone. One or the other of these schemes, then, must be what St. Paul denominates "*another Gospel*," and against which, and its abettors, he solemnly pronounces his apostolic anathema. The leading doctrines of Mohammed are not more diverse from the orthodox views of Christianity, than are those which you would have us hold in our fellowship. The followers of Mohammed believe in Jesus Christ as a good man, and a great prophet; and are accustomed to regard him, I believe, with as high veneration, as are the lower Unitarians." pp. 28, 29.

In the passage here alluded to, St. Paul says, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man [any one, whether man, or celestial spirit] preach any other Gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed." It has been the fashion with writers of the liberal party to soften, and explain away, every scriptural expression, which seems harsh to their ears. But the mildest interpretation, which we remember to have seen, of the phrase, *let him be accursed*, is this; "let him be separated from you; hold no communion with him; acknowledge him not as a Christian teacher, or a Christian man." We have, then, an apostolical command to withhold communion from those who teach "*another Gospel*." How does Mr. C. interpret the passage? He avoids any direct notice of it, though Dr. Worcester had formally cited it, in a preceding page. But the substance of what Mr. C. has to say on this subject, is contained in the following sentences:

"We do not pass sentence like apostles on many subjects of controversy among Christians, for this very plain reason—that we are *not* apostles. We are, what we labor never to forget, uninspired and fallible men; and we are apt to distrust ourselves, when persons of intelligence and piety, see cause to differ from us in the interpretation of Scripture. We dare not preach like apostles, on points which have perplexed and divided men of the profoundest thought and the purest lives; and we know from the genius and leading principles of Christianity, that these points are not, and cannot be, essential to salvation." pp. 11, 12.

What is this to the purpose of rejecting those, who preach another Gospel? Dr. W. did not say, that ministers at the present day *are* apostles; nor did he urge any man to form new rules for the government of the church, and deliver them with the authority of an apostle. All he insisted on was, that Christians should obey the plain and express directions of one who *was* an apostle, who

wrote under the influence of divine inspiration, and who delivered an authoritative rule of conduct for the church in every age. We do not hesitate to say, that the turn which Mr. Channing attempted to give to this subject is one of the most miserable subterfuges, to which a vanquished and forlorn disputant ever had recourse. St. Paul was not informing the churches of Galatia what *he* was about to do, or what he had done, in the execution of his apostolical commission, and under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. He commanded *them* what to do, in the exercise of a sound discretion and with a pure conscience; and through them he has commanded Christians of the present day what to do, in reference to any, who subvert the Gospel of Christ. Yes, he directed the plain, uneducated Christians of Galatia, and the same class of Christians in every age, to reject in the most decisive manner, every teacher of another Gospel. God himself has taught mankind, in this passage, that plain Christians, who have heard the true Gospel clearly preached, are *able* to distinguish it from any other Gospel; that they are *bound* thus to distinguish it; and that, far from being uncharitable in withholding communion from the teachers of another Gospel, this is a duty from which they cannot be excused. Mr. C. speaks of 'points, on which men of the profoundest thought, and the purest lives, are divided;' and which "we know," says he, "are not, and cannot be, essential to salvation." How does Mr. Channing *know*, that none of those points, 'on which men of the profoundest thought, and the purest lives have been divided, are essential to salvation?' What our readers may think on the subject we know not, but for ourselves, we set very lightly by this *knowledge* of Mr. Channing's. Before it can be entitled to a moment's consideration, Mr. C. must produce a revocation of the Apostle Paul's authority, and a substitution of his own; for it would be difficult to state a more absolute contradiction, than that which exists between him and the Apostle. Mr. Channing would establish this infallible rule, in determining what doctrines are non-essential to salvation; viz. that every doctrine, concerning which men of the profoundest thought and the purest lives have been divided, is to be reckoned in this class; so that none of these doctrines, nor all of them put together, can constitute "another Gospel." But what says the Apostle? The passage which we have quoted, may be paraphrased thus: "Though I myself, commissioned, received, and accredited as an apostle, should attempt to subvert the Gospel which I first preached to you;—though a celestial spirit, from the regions of light and glory, should promulgate another Gospel;—you are bound immediately to reject, as the case may be, either me or him, as a false teacher, a reprobate, lying under the curse of God. Should any one, I repeat the weighty decision;—should *any* one, whatever his character may be; how great so ever his attainments, his eloquence, his zeal; however pure and holy his life may seem; though he appear to unite every desirable quality, from the intellectual power and dignity of the highest seraph to the amiable docility of the loveliest child; yet, if he preaches a different Gospel from that which you have already



received, he is to be rejected as a false teacher, a reprobate, lying under the curse of God. And whether he does preach a different Gospel, or not, you, plain Christians of Galatia, are to be the judges, without relying on his own plausible declarations, or those of his abettors. The question is decided, once for all, that the doctrines of every future preacher of the Gospel are to be judged of, not by his pretensions, not by his attainments, not by his apparent character, but by the unerring rule of Divine Revelation." What becomes of Mr. Channing's rule about men of the profoundest thought, and the purest lives?

The same apostle says, in another passage, "Let God be true, but every man a liar;" that is, as we understand it, "Let the plain declarations, which God has made in his word, be received according to their obvious import; and let every man, who contradicts these declarations, be esteemed as a liar, a false teacher, a contemner of God's word, whatever the pretensions of such a man may be, and however distinguished he may appear for integrity, sincerity, and sanctity." Which is to be followed, the Apostle, or Mr. Channing?

Happy is it for mankind, that the rule which Mr. Channing delivers with such confidence, is pointedly condemned in the Bible. If adopted and acted upon, it would prove an *ignis fatuus*, leading into endless perplexity and difficulty, and abandoning its followers in the "great Serbonian bog" of universal skepticism. The direct tendency, if not the intention, of sanctioning this rule is, to persuade the world, that there can be little danger in following, where men of the profoundest thought and the purest lives have led the way. All that a person has to do, then, in order to prove the safety of the doctrines which he holds, is to find some man, who is worthy to be acknowledged as a file-leader. The only inquiries to be settled are these two: Is the leader in question a man of profound thought? Is he a man of a pure life? These questions once answered in the affirmative, it is impossible that any doctrine, which this leader rejects, should be essential to salvation.

It is not difficult for a man to acquire the reputation of a deep-thinker, especially with his own followers. And when the reputation is once acquired, it will be perpetuated in the sect, so long as the spirit of propagandism exists. It may justly be admitted, indeed, that the founders of most sects have been men of uncommon talents, of considerable acquirements, and of assiduous study. They have no doubt generally been well persuaded of the truth of their schemes, and heartily devoted to them. But all this does not prove, that their schemes have been any thing better than "wind and confusion."

Nor does it imply the existence of true religion, to have obtained the reputation of leading a pure life. We think it very easy for an infidel to lead as good a life, as that which has been in fact exhibited, by many professed Christians, who have been canonized, and almost idolized, by their friends and followers.

Let us see, for a moment, how an inquiry after truth would appear, if conducted upon these principles. A certain man embraces a doctrine, which is founded in dangerous error. He is warned of his danger; but replies, "I have no fears; this doctrine has been embraced by men of the profoundest thought and the purest lives." Suppose the fact to be, that his leaders are men of stupid minds and corrupt lives; how is he to be convinced of it? Whoever undertakes the task of convincing him, will run the hazard of being reproached as a bigot, a calumniator, an unauthorized, and censorious judge of his fellow Christians. Thus the controversy, instead of resolving itself into a scriptural inquiry, degenerates into a miserable altercation about the personal character of certain leaders, who lived centuries ago, and thousands of miles from the scene of controversy; and whose character, if they were living, and on the spot, could be justly estimated by no other than the Omniscient. Of all questions, those, which relate to the personal character of individuals, who are hated by one party and the favorites of another, are the most unlikely to be amicably settled. In the first place, all men have faults, which the eagle eyes of their enemies will be very apt to discover and magnify. Secondly; many virtues are changed into faults by the prejudices of an adversary. Thirdly; most men possess qualities, which bear some resemblance to virtues, and which the voice of friendship, or of favoritism, can eulogize as the most splendid of virtues.

If a reputation for purity of life in a teacher is to be the passport for all the doctrines which he teaches, so far as to assure his followers, that there can be nothing dangerous in these doctrines, then the question, *What is purity of life?* will furnish a subject of endless debate. On no question whatever would there be a more radical difference of opinion. Must the purity of a teacher equal that of Dr Price, who, as Mrs. Barbauld is confident, might demand admission into heaven as a matter of justice? Or will it be sufficient to come up to the standard of Hume, who, in the opinion of Adam Smith, approached "as nearly to the idea of a perfectly wise and virtuous man, as perhaps the nature of human frailty will permit?" Or shall Rousseau be the model, who, after a life of impiety, vice, and infidelity, boasted that he was about to surrender his soul pure into the hands of his Maker?

It has always been the policy of Unitarians to praise each other most extravagantly, as being possessed of every intellectual and moral endowment. The reason of this policy is very obvious. If the praise, which they lavish so freely, is not allowed to be just, they exclaim, What bigotry! What illiberality! What an attachment to sect that must be, which can see nothing good out of its own pale! If the justice of their praise is in any respect admitted, or even if the subject of personal character is passed over in silence, they dwell long and often on the question, "Is it possible that such great men, such good men, the very best men in the world, can be fundamentally erroneous?" In either of these alternatives, their appeal is not in vain to the passions and feelings of a large class of



readers. Yet these are the writers, who profess to decry a reliance on human authority!

To leave this topic, on which we have dwelt longer than our limits can well afford, Dr. Worcester had used the word orthodox, as it is commonly used, as a term of distinction, not of praise. Mr. C. endeavors to take an advantage of this use of the word, understands it as a term of praise, and seems to make a very serious business of it. As the meaning of Dr. W. is perfectly apparent, we really wonder what could induce Mr. C. to refuse his antagonist the common and proper use of a very common word. Drowning men catch very eagerly at straws.

Mr. Channing says, p. 23, that the doctrine of the Trinity "has for ages perplexed and distressed the mind of almost every reflecting Christian." This is a specimen of the loose, random manner; in which Mr. C. customarily ventures his assertions. We are confident, that he labors under a great mistake on this subject. We have been personally acquainted with many reflecting Christians, in different conditions of life, from the aged, learned, pious divine, or the venerable, contemplative matron, to the thoughtful, devout farmer or mechanic; from persons who resemble the late Dr. Rodgers and the late Mrs. Graham of New-York to those who are not unlike the Shepherd of Salisbury Plain; and we have not found them distressed in the manner described by Mr. Channing. We therefore utterly discredit his statement. It appears by Dr. Worcester's Third Letter, that the doctrine of the Trinity does not 'distress his mind;' and we know, that 'many reflecting Christians' most cordially feel as he does, and unite with him in considering this doctrine, as a theme of delightful meditation, as a source of perpetual and holy joy.

Unitarians have always endeavored to make a display of their own numbers; and, in doing this, they have often set all truth and decency at defiance. When the subject of their great numbers is exhausted, they attempt to persuade their readers, that most professed Trinitarians are in fact Unitarians, if they only knew how to tell what they believe; and, when driven from this ground, they dwell upon the distressed and comfortless condition of Trinitarians. But these arts, separately or conjointly, will not answer the purpose intended. We mean not to deny, that the minds of individuals have been distressed on the subject of the Trinity. That is probably the case with most of those, who ultimately become Unitarians. But this distress can be traced to other causes, than the mysterious nature of the doctrine itself; and facts are far, very far, from warranting the broad assertion, which we have just quoted.

Mr. Channing says, p. 27, that the present controversy "primarily relates to the moral character of the great body of liberal Christians." This is another random assertion, for which there is not the least color, or pretence. Neither our Review, nor Dr. Worcester's Letter, said a single word, directly or implicitly, about the "moral character of the great body of liberal Christians." We are sorry that Mr. C. had not taken some pains not to make

groundless assertions; especially such as have a direct tendency to arouse the passions of this "great body of liberal Christians" without any reason.

In answer to Dr. Worcester's declaration, addressed to Mr. Channing, "The Savior whom you acknowledge is infinitely inferior to ours," Mr. C. says, p. 26, "We believe that GOD saves us by his son Jesus Christ, in whom he dwells, and through whom he bestows pardon and eternal life. A higher Savior we do not know, and cannot conceive." To this passage Dr. W. very properly rejoins: "I did suppose you would yet acknowledge JESUS CHRIST to be your SAVIOR. Your declaration, however, if it has any pertinency, plainly imports that you do not." Mr. C. endeavors to evade the force of this rejoinder, in the Note to his second series of Remarks. It is impossible, however, to make out this evasion. Whatever Mr. C. intended, his language clearly disclaimed Jesus Christ as his Savior; and the declarations which he has quoted from Scripture, as his justification, are not at all similar to the one in question.

Mr. Channing's defence of what he had said concerning our Review rests entirely upon the assumption, that he had stated nothing more than the "impression," which it made on his own mind, and which it had a tendency to make on the minds of readers at large. He implicitly admits, that a "verbal critic, with a dictionary in his hand," might make a great deal less of it, than he had actually made. In other words, we were not to be judged by the *language* which we had used; but by the *impressions*, which men excessively goaded and irritated by our disclosures, and greatly excited by imparting their angry feelings to each other, had hastily received from it. Mr. C. applies the same rule of interpretation to Dr. Worcester's Letter. He accordingly sums up, in a very obnoxious form, what he states to be "the obvious import of the concluding part of" that letter. As we have not room to enter into particulars, we do not quote the passage. Soon after Mr. Channing's Remarks appeared, Dr. W. addressed to him a Second Letter. A prominent part of this letter is occupied in proving, that Mr. C. had made "a flagrant misstatement," where he professes to give the "obvious import" of the First Letter; and in calling upon him "to retract." After correcting this misstatement, and several others of minor consequence, Dr. W. proceeds to show, at some length the radical difference between Trinitarians and Unitarians. He shows, that the orthodox believe in the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, and that Unitarians disallow such an inspiration; that the orthodox believe in the doctrine of the Trinity; that they hold this doctrine to be fundamentally important; that they believe in the divinity of Christ, in his incarnation, in his expiatory sacrifice, and in justification by faith alone; while Unitarians reject these doctrines, or entirely explain them away.

At the commencement of this Letter, Dr. W. expresses his deliberate judgment, in which he had the concurrence of all with whom he had conversed, that Mr. C. had not directly met him at a single



point, shown him to be incorrect in a single statement, nor refuted him in a single position, or argument; and, in a word, that Mr. C.'s Remarks were no *real* answer to his First Letter.' Dr. W. then inquires, by what means Mr. C. had been able to give his Remarks the *appearance* and *effect* of an answer; for that it had that appearance and that effect, in the view of some persons, is admitted. By a very clear and powerful analysis Dr. W. shows, that the Remarks of Mr. C. owed whatever efficacy they possessed, to the *imputation of a bad intention*; to his representing Dr. W.'s Letter as *light and trifling*; to his *diverting the reader's attention from the point and the argument*; and to *misstatement*.

This Second Letter is written with moderation, solemnity, and great ability. It bears evident testimony, not only to the conscientiousness of the writer, but to his care, patience, and diligence, as well as to his profound veneration for the Scriptures, and his habit of fair and close investigation.

Mr. Channing, having been called upon in a solemn manner to retract, judged it expedient to publish Remarks on Dr. Worcester's Second Letter. He attempts to vindicate his interpretation of the obvious import of the First Letter, by a particular examination of several passages. His grand rule of interpretation continues to be the "impression," which a writing makes on his mind, and the minds of his friends. He makes some further developements of the creed of the liberal party in this country, and proceeds to consider what he is pleased to call "the methods of rendering Unitarians odious." These methods are, according to Mr. C. 'painting in the strongest colors the differences between Unitarians and Trinitarians;' 'representing Unitarians as obliged by their sentiments to give up the doctrine of the atonement;' 'asserting that they disbelieve the doctrine of the Trinity because it is mysterious;' 'addressing the fears of Christians;' and charging Unitarians 'with attempting to conceal the differences between themselves and Trinitarians.' The Remarks are concluded with a consideration of what Mr. C. calls "the system of exclusion and denunciation." On this subject, he goes through the common topics of Unitarian declamation, with rather uncommon zeal and spirit. Though he has nothing, which can be called fair argument, he occasionally rises into the region of eloquence. He concludes with an earnest attempt to dissuade from an open, formal separation between Trinitarians and Unitarians. Not a few of his reasonings and assertions are contradictory to each other; but, as a whole, the pamphlet was calculated to produce some effect upon the party in whose behalf it was written. All the great points in Dr. Worcester's Letters were omitted, or evaded, as before; and recourse is had by Mr. C. to his former subterfuge, that Christians of the present day are not obliged to reject the preachers of "another Gospel," because these Christians are not themselves apostles: that is, Christians are not obliged to obey a plain rule of Scripture, because they are not themselves inspired.

Dr. Worcester's Third Letter is one of the ablest pamphlets, which any controversy has produced. It ought to be generally circulated and read; and we are persuaded it cannot be read, without producing a deep and lasting effect highly favorable to the cause of truth. The vindication of Mr. C.'s misstatement, which that gentleman had attempted, was quickly and effectually despatched; and Dr. W. advanced to an examination of the further developement of the creed, which Mr. C. had given, as common to himself and his particular friends. After quoting a passage from this creed, Dr. W. proceeds, in the following eloquent strain.

"With these 'liberal Christians,' then, it is a matter of utter uncertainty, of endless doubt, and, it would seem, of cold and lofty indifference, who the Savior of the world is!—whether he is a created, or an uncreated being; whether he existed from eternity, or begun to exist in time; whether he is a God, who, though inferior to the 'supreme God,' has yet a rightful claim to religious worship, or only their fellow servant, to whom no divine honors belong! From other passages, on which I shall have occasion in another place to remark, it appears that the same uncertainty, and doubt, and indifference exist with these same 'liberal Christians,' in regard to what Jesus Christ has done for them:—whether he died to expiate their sins with blood of inestimable merit, or whether 'in consequence' merely 'of what he has done and suffered, the punishment of sin is averted from the penitent;' as it may have been, in consequence of the sufferings and labors, the instructions and intercessions of Paul and other good men, by whose means sinners have been brought to repentance!—Of course, there must be similar uncertainty, doubt, and indifference, as to the obligations which they owe to him; as to the love and trust, the thanks and honors to which he is entitled.—Do they then honor the Son, even as they honor, or should honor the Father? They do not know who or what the Son is. Are they blessed in putting their trust in him? They do not know to what extent, or for what purposes he is to be trusted. Do they delight to join in the heavenly anthem, 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing?' They do not know that he *is* worthy thus to be adored and praised!—Ah! where are we? Into what a region of frost, of darkness, of the shadow of death are we advancing!—Is this, Sir, the light which is so ardently hailed, and so loudly proclaimed by the 'rational Christians,' of this favored age? Is it here that we are to find the grand consummation of divine knowledge, that 'purer system of Christianity,' to which you and your 'liberal' brethren would guide mankind? Is it in this chilling, dismal clime, that professed Christians of every name are to meet together in one blessed fellowship? No wonder then that Jews and Infidels, Mohammedans and Pagans are invited to participate in the blessedness. And no wonder, that they who adore the Lord Jesus, as '*the true God and eternal life*,' and delight in the ascription, 'Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins, in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father,—to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever,' should decline the invitation." pp. 13, 14.

Dr. W. then urges the unreasonableness of supposing, that the Scriptures have left the primary subjects of inspiration in such obscurity, as the writings of Mr. C. and other Unitarians would lead us to believe. He examines the question, whether the appellation, *Son of God*, implies any inferiority of nature, and shows the doctrine of the primitive church on that subject. He states the system of Dr. Clark, and concludes, justly for aught that we can see, that "if there was ever a Tritheist in Christendom, Dr. Clark was



one; and if, (as Mr. C. had asserted,) "the liberal Christians in this part of our country agree substantially with Dr. Clark," instead of being Unitarians, they are Tritheists." He goes into a very sublime, because a very scriptural, explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity; of which we should gladly quote several pages, did our limits permit. He introduces a very weighty passage from the Bishop of Durham, whom Mr. C. had called the "profound Butler," and claimed as an ally, but whose belief, on the subject of the Trinity, was most directly opposite to Mr. Channing's. The popular objection of Unitarians and infidels, that "it is out of our power to believe a proposition of which we *do not know the meaning*," is scrutinized; and it clearly appears, as an inference from Mr. Channing's most abundant concessions, that Unitarians do not know the meaning of the single essential article of their creed; viz. "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God;" nor of the proposition, "Christ died for our sins."

Dr. W. does not concede, however, that the case is the same with Trinitarians in regard to the doctrines which they believe. He contends, that himself and his brethren "understand the meaning of the proposition, The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three Divine Persons in one God." We are very happy that this subject fell in the way of Dr. Worcester. It is one, which has afforded Unitarians much self-complacency, and on which they seem to think themselves triumphant. For a year or two we have intended to examine it, and are not a little pleased, that the discussion has fallen into abler hands. On the objection of mystery, we quote a short paragraph:

"The objection of mystery, which you and other Unitarians are perpetually urging against the Trinity, might be urged, and has been urged, with equal reason, and with equal force, against all the principal doctrines of religion, both natural and revealed. If we are to fly before this objection, we must fly not only from orthodoxy to Unitarianism, but from Unitarianism to Deism, from Deism to atheism, and from atheism to universal skepticism. If the pretensions of the "rational Christian" to superior wisdom, because, to avoid mystery, he denies the Trinity, are well founded; then for the same reason, the Deist is wiser than the rational Christian, the atheist is wiser than the Deist, and the universal skeptic is the wisest man of all. And upon this scale, I suppose, the pretensions to wisdom are actually graduated." p. 32.

Dr. W. next examines the creed of Unitarians, that is, of Mr. C. and his friends, on the subject of the *atonement*; and this discussion forms a very interesting part of the pamphlet. He shews, that Mr. C.'s views of this doctrine are entirely vague and ambiguous; that he evidently framed a creed, which should embrace all Unitarians, whether they believe in the atonement or not.

In answer to what Mr. C. had said respecting the evils of separation, and the obligations of charity, Dr. W. inquires into the scriptural meaning of *charity*, and illustrates the subject by the example of our Savior and his apostles. He forcibly contrasts this charity with the indifference to religious doctrines contended for by



Dr. Price, and many other Unitarians, beside Mr. Channing. He then comes to the question, whether, as Mr. C.'s whole system of fellowship supposes, it is impossible for an uninspired man to attain any certainty respecting the great truths of the Gospel. This discussion is so admirable, that we cannot resist our inclination to lay it before our readers, as containing a specimen of the powerful reasoning employed throughout the pamphlet, and as exhibiting in a very strong light the true question at issue.

"Is it however so, that no uninspired man can know, nor has a right to judge what the true Gospel of Christ is? For what purpose then were the apostles and the prophets before them inspired? Was it merely for their own benefit? or at most for theirs, and the benefit of others of their own times? For what purpose then were the revelations which were communicated to them, committed to writing, and transmitted with so much care to succeeding generations? Of what use are the Scriptures, if no uninspired man can know with any certainty what are the doctrines contained in them?—The celebrated Hume has asserted, that miracles could be of no use, as attestations to a divine revelation, excepting to such as were eye-witnesses of them; because no other persons could have sufficient evidence of the facts. But I believe that even that gigantic adversary of the Gospel never went so far as your argument goes: never undertook to assert that a divine revelation, though well attested, could never make any doctrine or truth certain, excepting to inspired men; because no other persons could ever know with any certainty what doctrines or truths are revealed. Had he lighted upon this discovery, he would have found an argument against revelation, incomparably more available than any which he has urged; an argument which, if correct in its premises, must be decisive in its conclusion: for unquestionably a God of infinite wisdom and goodness would never communicate a revelation to the world, for the instruction and faith of uninspired men, if none but the inspired could understand it, or attain to any certainty in regard to its doctrines. Upon this Unitarian principle, inspiration, to answer its purpose, must be continued throughout all ages; just as Hume contended that miracles must be.

"This point demands very particular attention, for it is the very hinge on which the question respecting fellowship turns. Let it then be again distinctly noted, that you have found yourself compelled to concede, that the inspired apostles did exclude from fellowship those who embraced another Gospel, or doctrines or opinions subversive of the Gospel of Christ. This establishes the principle decisively, that it would be right to separate from such now, could it only be determined what the Gospel of Christ is, and what another Gospel. But this, you contend, no uninspired man or body of men has a right to determine. The Unitarian system, as set forth by Mr. Belsham, is clearly opposite, in every essential point, to the orthodox system. Yet no uninspired man has a right to determine, which of these two opposite systems is the true Gospel; no one has a right to pronounce either of them false! And, therefore, the believers in either of them have no right to separate from the believers in the other!—If it be really so, then let us hear no more of the great Protestant principle, that *the Scriptures are a sufficient rule of faith*; for instead of being a sufficient rule, they are no rule at all. They do not enable or warrant us to decide between two systems, fundamentally and diametrically opposite, which is true, or whether both of them are false. What the Gospel of Christ is, no uninspired man can tell. If any undertake to determine, and to pronounce an opposite system another Gospel, they are to be regarded as illiberal and uncharitable men, "proud and arrogant" pretenders to "infallibility," ignorant "bigots," and odious "persecutors."

"The question respecting fellowship or separation certainly resolves itself into this point. If the Scriptures are a sufficient rule of faith, if from them uninspired men can know what the doctrines of Christ are, or what the



true Gospel is; then they have apostolic, divine authority for withdrawing and withholding fellowship from those, who reject the true, and embrace another Gospel. If the Scriptures are not a sufficient rule of faith; if no uninspired man can know what the Gospel of Christ is; then the "faith of Christians is vain, and our preaching also is vain;" and we have yet to wait, in gloomy uncertainty, in dismal darkness, until God in his sovereign goodness shall again bless the world, or some portion of it, with the gift of inspiration." pp. 52, 53.

We should really be pleased to see Mr. Channing undertake to grapple with this passage. If he should not be willing to try his strength upon it, let him take a long passage, which Dr. Worcester quoted from Chillingworth, in the conclusion of which that able writer declares, "I do heartily acknowledge and believe the articles of our faith to be in themselves truths as certain and infallible, as the very common principles of geometry or metaphysics."

Mr. Channing had assumed it as a fact, that the false teachers, in the days of the apostles, were men of much worse character than any class of teachers in our days; that they knew distinctly that they were opposing the truth, and were therefore justly excluded from Christian fellowship. Dr. W. exposes the fallacy of these assumptions; and concludes, that "there is no evidence to show, nor reason to believe, that the adversaries of the truth were not as sincere, as candid, as virtuous, and as respectable, in the first days of the Gospel, as they are in the present age."

Mr. C. had complained, that a condemning sentence should be passed upon the characters of men; by which Dr. W. understands him to mean 'a sentence of non-communion.' The inquiry is then made, whether Unitarians do not claim and exercise the right of excluding from their fellowship persons who deny their one essential article? And yet a denial of this article results merely 'from difference of opinion,' from 'mistake in judgment,' and may, if Mr. Channing is to be trusted, be perfectly innocent. Not only does Mr. C. exclude from Christian fellowship on account of opinion; but, on the same account, passes 'a condemning sentence on the characters of men.' Dr. W. then selects only a small part of the passages, in which Mr. C. had poured forth a torrent of obloquy and reproach against all, in every age, who have thought it right to exclude professed Christians from the church, on account of their doctrinal errors. We think Mr. C. must have been somewhat startled at the number, violence, and opprobrious character of the epithets, which had flowed so volubly from his pen; and which clearly indicated, that the habit of using the language of vituperation and abuse was but too prevalent with him and his friends. At the close of this exposure Dr. W. declares, that 'it was with no common feelings of grief he found himself compelled to say, that a heavier sentence than Mr. Channing's, against the disciples of the Lord, against "the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth," had never, he believed, been pronounced, by the bitterest of enemies, either pagan or infidel.'

Mr. C. had insisted, that the "only standard of Christian character is the *life*." Dr. W. was not disposed to controvert the declaration



of our Savior, "By their fruits shall ye know them." He showed, however, at large, and with decisive effect, that *fruits*, in the scriptural sense, do not intend external morality merely. Indeed nothing can be clearer, than that *fruits* are relied upon in contradistinction from mere *professions*, as the test of character. Under *fruits* are comprehended all discoverable evidences of a person's real character, in opposition to his own unsupported *pretensions* to virtue and piety. The Scriptures plainly teach, that the reception of the cardinal *doctrines* of Christianity is not less indispensable, than the practice of its moral *precepts*, to the very existence of the Christian graces.

The Letter closes with a view of some of the 'frightful consequences,' which Mr. Channing apprehends from the contemplated separation.

We have faithfully given the outlines of this masterly production, and can assure our readers, that it is well worthy of deliberate and repeated perusal, and to be kept on the shelf as a complete and unanswerable refutation of the most common and plausible sophistries of Unitarian writers. We understand Mr. C. pronounces it to be *so bad*, that he will not answer it. We applaud this resolution.

It now remains, that we introduce some miscellaneous topics, which it seemed most proper to reserve for the close of the article.

Dr. Worcester observes, in his First Letter, that Mr. Channing 'seems to forget that his liberal brethren in England have not only proposed a separation, but have actually carried the proposition into effect.' p. 31. Mr. C. in his Remarks on this letter, p. 22, assumes it as a fact, that the separation made by Unitarians in England is much less to be dreaded than the one proposed by Dr. W. as the former is only "a *separation in worship*, a separation produced by the adoption of prayers, hymns, and doxologies, accommodated to their peculiar sentiments." Dr. W. asks, in his Second Letter, p. 20, "What is this, I pray you, but a thorough disruption of fellowship, a complete non-communion?" In his last pamphlet, p. 47, Mr. C. describes the worship of the English Unitarians as "singularly free from peculiarities;" and says "that all Christians may join in it without hesitation or pain." "I learn," says he, "that Mr. Lindsey introduced into his chapel the Liturgy of the Church of England, omitting only the few parts, in which the doctrine of the Trinity is recognized, and directing all the prayers to the Father through the Son. This is the worship, which is most common among all denominations in this country, and by which no Christian can be offended. Most sincerely do I wish, that our public services may be marked by this liberal character."

Doubtless "all denominations in this country" profess to offer prayers "to the Father through the Son." But if Mr. Channing means, that they so direct their prayers to the Father through the Son, as to withhold divine worship from the Son, his assertion is notoriously and grossly incorrect; if he does not mean this, he means nothing to the purpose. Is Mr. Channing serious in supposing, that all Christians may, 'without hesitation or pain,' join in prayers, from which all worship to the Son and the Holy Spirit is designedly and systematically excluded? He ought to know better. Are we to take, as a specimen of Mr. C.'s accuracy, his assertion that the Liturgy of the Church of



England recognizes the doctrine of the Trinity in a "few parts" only? If we are, this is a pretty fair sample. As to the *wish*, expressed by Mr. C. in the last sentence quoted above, we think Trinitarians, who alter their prayers for the sake of pleasing Unitarians, are chargeable with a very unwarrantable compliance. If they believe the Lord Jesus Christ to be worthy of the highest divine honors; and that he receives, and will forever receive, these honors from saints and angels in heaven; how can they pretend to excuse themselves for withholding that worship which they believe justly due? and withholding it for the sake of gratifying those, whom they believe to be in dangerous error; thus, in their own judgment, sacrificing truth to error?

The design of Mr. C. in the passage now under consideration, was to prove, not only that Trinitarians and the lowest Socinians may hold each other in fellowship, but that they may actually unite in public worship "without hesitation or pain." In proving this, he evidently supposed he should shew Dr. W. to be incorrect, in what *he* had alleged concerning the separation recommended by Unitarians in England. But could Mr. C. be ignorant, that Dr. W. relied on the representations of Mr. Belsham? And does not Mr. Belsham say, concerning the system of Trinitarians compared with that of Unitarians, "No! No! Opinions such as these can no more harmonize with each other than light and darkness, than Christ and Belial. They who hold doctrines so *diametrically opposite* CANNOT BE FELLOW-WORSHIPPERS IN THE SAME TEMPLE." Now we humbly conceive, that Mr. Belsham is here the advocate, both of separation in worship, and of non-communion. If Trinitarians and Unitarians "cannot be fellow-worshippers in the same temple," we do not see how they can join, (as Mr. C. says they can,) in the same worship "without hesitation or pain." And as to communion, Mr. C. must either admit Mr. Belsham to be the advocate of "separation," of "exclusion," of "denunciation," or he must prove, that light and darkness mean substantially the same thing, and that Christ and Belial may really be on very good terms with each other.

Mr. C. inquires, in the note to his last pamphlet, p. 46, "why cannot this controversy be conducted with calmness, without impeachment of character or motives, and without appeals to popular feeling?" Indeed, why can it not? We think Mr. C. ought to answer his own question. We should be extremely fond of knowing, whether Mr. C. considers his three pamphlets as being distinguished for *calmness*. If he does, his mind must be one of the greatest curiosities, which the moral universe contains. Again; why did Mr. C. find it necessary to impeach the *character and motives* of Dr. W. and of orthodox Christians generally, who hold to the duty of excluding men from Christian fellowship for religious error? As to *appeals to popular feeling*, if we may judge of the tendency of a writing by its appearance to our own mind, or by its effects on the public, no pamphlets were ever more entirely and characteristically made up of such appeals, than are the pamphlets of Mr. Channing. The Layman entirely fails in this particular. He rouses nobody's passions but his own. Mr. C.'s Letter to Mr. Thacher excited a more uncontrollable tempest of indignation, rage, and a desire of revenge, than has ever been observed in this region within the memory of man; and this, if not its only effect, was the prominent one. Dr. W.'s Letters have, on the contrary, assuaged the stormy passions, directed the



minds of men to topics of sober inquiry, and given great consolation on the bed of sickness and of death.

We had intended to give some specimens of Mr. C.'s contradiction of himself. For one of these we refer the reader to the note, at p. 66 of Dr. W.'s Third Letter. We briefly mention another. Mr. C. expatiates very freely, after the manner of all latitudinarians, on the evil of being positive, dogmatical, and censorious; and on the duty of being diffident, modest, meek, and remembering that all men have their frailties, their prejudices, and their attachment to system. "Let us be"—says he to Mr. Thacher—"Let us be what we profess to be, patient inquirers after truth, open to conviction, willing to listen to objections, willing to renounce error, willing to believe that *we as well as others* may have been warped in our opinions, by education and situation, and that others may have acquired important truths which *through weakness or prejudice*, we may have overlooked." pp. 28, 29. "*Every man*," says he in his last pamphlet, "is partial to his own opinions, because they are his own, and *his self-will and pride* are wounded by contradiction." p. 32. We might quote many passages, which recommend diffidence in forming and expressing opinions. Indeed, almost all Mr. Channing's declamation falls at once to the ground, unless this proposition can be supported; viz. that no professed Christian has a right to say, that any other professed Christian embraces fundamental or important errors. As a practical comment on the diffidence, which he had been recommending, his last pamphlet contains this passage: "But Unitarians [and of course Mr. C. with the rest] never stop here. They *always declare* that Scripture *with one voice* disowns the doctrine of the Trinity, and that of all the **FICTIONS OF THEOLOGICALS**, the doctrine of three persons in the one God, has perhaps the *least countenance from the Bible*." This is the *modest man*, the enemy of all positiveness and dogmatism!

When Dr. W. wrote his First Letter, he was careful that Mr. C. should receive a copy, accompanied by a note of fraternal courtesy, before the pamphlet was published for sale. This attention was not reciprocated by Mr. C. 'in either of these respects;' and when he thought proper to attempt an answer to the letter, he addressed his Remarks to the public. The same course of conduct was adhered to by each party, we understand, through the whole controversy; and Dr. W. continued to address his letters very respectfully to Mr. C. while the latter turned away from his antagonist, and addressed his speech to the public. We should not mention this, were it not a fair example of the politeness, the urbanity, practised by the liberal party toward their opponents. We have known several instances, when, on public occasions, gentlemen of the liberal party have been treated with courtesy and respect; not worshipped, indeed, as though their opinions were infallible, or their arguments incapable of refutation; but listened to with seriousness and candor, and regarded as gentlemen of education, and of high standing in society, should be regarded. We have not seen this courteous treatment generally reciprocated; but have several times taken notice that it was met with a sour, morose, repulsive aspect and demeanor. Let those of our readers, who have the means of observation, bear in mind this trait of the liberal party. If we are in an error, we should be happy to see it corrected.

Mr. Channing complains, that our representations are injurious to himself and his brethren; particularly by giving to persons *at a dis-*



tance a false account of the clergy of the liberal party, of their preaching and their doctrines. We state, for his serious consideration, the following fact. There have been many instances, in which gentlemen of education and great respectability have visited this region from a distance, and have used all the means in their power to learn the nature of the theology taught by the clergy of the liberal party. Of these gentlemen a considerable number have been men of piety, well acquainted with the Scriptures; and not a few have been clergymen. They had heard much of Boston divinity, and had seen our representations. They of course heard all the preaching they could, and attended to it with great interest. Not one of these gentlemen, so far as our knowledge extends, ever expressed an opinion that the clergy of the liberal party had been injured. Many, to our certain knowledge, have declared, that the preaching generally heard from gentlemen of that party was more *destitute of the Gospel*, and often more *contrary to the Gospel*, than they had ever before imagined.

Mr. Channing has applied to our Review many approbrious epithets, of which we are not disposed to take the least notice. That article has received the approbation of men, in whose presence Mr. C. would not assume any tone of superiority;—of men whose consciences are not less tender, whose motives are not less pure, and whose decisions are not less weighty, than those of Mr. C. and his brethren. We do not mean to imply, that the approbation of men, however great and good, is a safe rule of conduct. But, in the present case, our own deliberate opinion of what was right is confirmed by the judgment of persons of high standing in the churches, on both sides of the Atlantic. This we think sufficient to counterbalance the “denunciations,” which were so authoritatively uttered by Mr. Channing.

It is remarkable, that in the Christian Instructor published at Edinburgh in June last, (the same month in which our Review appeared,) there was a Review of certain Unitarian pamphlets, which had recently been published in Scotland. The occasion is seized by the Reviewer to expose the ridiculous and insufferable manner, in which Unitarians praise each other; and the whole article evinces most clearly that the sect is precisely the same on each side of the water.

It was manifest in our Review, that Unitarianism of the Priestleian sort, is in the near neighborhood of infidelity. This is abundantly proved, in the article to which we have just referred. “The sincere and conscientious Deist,” says Mr. Cogan, as quoted by the Christian Instructor, “cannot be far from the kingdom of heaven.” “The objections of a rational and virtuous Deist,” says the same writer, “cannot be against the pure primitive principles of our religion; they can only be opposed to doctrines of fallible men, some of which must be spurious, and others of an inferior importance. They are all of a mere speculative nature.”

In short, this Unitarian writer goes on, in such a manner as would lead to the conclusion, that every “rational and virtuous Deist,” (that is, every Deist who *says* he is rational and virtuous,) ought to be received into Christian fellowship; a conclusion to which Dr. Worcester proved that Mr. Channing’s principles would lead him. “Did the general creed of Christians,” says Mr. Smith, the Unitarian coadjutor of Mr. Yates, “comprise only the simple and sublime doctrine of Unitarianism, and were the lives of its professors in any degree consistent with their avowed belief, I am persuaded that there would scarcely be an infidel to be found: for in this system there is nothing which the understanding can reject as unreasonable, or the heart oppose as malevolent; the enlightened must perceive it to be just, and the good must wish it to be true.” What a direct opposition is



this to the whole tenor of our Savior's preaching. What a contradiction to the uniform testimony of Scripture on the subject of unbelief. And yet Mr. Smith can talk of his reverence for the Scriptures, with as much fluency as Mr. Channing. He is not afraid, however, to speak of "the common doctrine of future punishment as a doctrine which, he is happy to declare, Unitarians have sense enough to distrust, and goodness enough to de-test." In this irreverent, presumptuous, profane manner, do leading Unitarians permit themselves to speak of the most solemn and awful truths of revelation; and with such men as these does Mr. C. insist, that the orthodox should hold Christian communion.

Our readers will remember, that Mr. Wells wrote a short letter to the Editor of the Panoplist, which was published in our number for July, and which we have already once mentioned in this article. Though we by no means agree with Mr. Wells, in the interpretation of his letter to Mr. Belsham, we do cordially agree with him in referring that letter, with his observations upon it, to our readers. It was with pleasure that we inserted his short explanatory letter; particularly as he did not, like Mr. Channing and the Layman, fall into a passion, nor utter such reproaches, as would have been ill suited to his character as a scholar and a gentleman. We can even apologize for the obnoxious part of his letter to Mr. Belsham; that in which he made so free with the characters of the orthodox. The letter was written in haste, without any expectation that it would be published; and we presume the expressions which it contained were not weighed with much accuracy. In this way it may have come to pass, that several paragraphs, probably without much consideration, were filled with the cant of the party.

We intended to quote the first paragraph of the Layman's pamphlet, and to exhibit, in as brief a manner as possible, the folly, extravagance, and perverse ignorance, or total disregard of truth, which are manifest in that paragraph alone. Our readers would then be able to judge what sort of a writer the Layman is, and to what credit his representations are entitled. But we have not the room necessary for this purpose. Dr. Worcester appropriated two pages, in a postscript, to the consideration of the Layman's rhapsody of 72 pages; which was quite as much as it deserved. Let not our readers suppose, that we consider the liberal party as responsible for this pamphlet. We have never heard, that it was approved by a single individual of that party, except the writer; and, unless we have been misinformed, it has been regarded by the party in general with entire disgust and contempt. We do not see how any man could more effectually destroy his own reputation as a writer, than the Layman has done by the pamphlet in question. Still we are not to forget, that this miserable compound of rant and malevolence is the production of a man, who has been distinguished in the liberal party by his talents and his zeal, and who is now considered as the most active member of the Corporation of Harvard College. The Layman will probably suppose, that we wish to prevent his pamphlet from being read. This is not the case. It is true that we cannot conscientiously advise any one to buy such an effusion, unless for the mere purpose of seeing how wretchedly a man of talents, and of learning on some subjects, can write in a bad cause. For the future, we think there is little hazard in asserting, that the writings of the Layman, whether he attacks the character of individuals or of large bodies of men, will receive as little attention, and exert as little influence, as his adversaries could desire.

Both Mr. Channing and the Layman have introduced the President of Harvard College, and attempted to vindicate him from the observations made concerning him in our Review. We had mentioned "a letter of consolation and encouragement, written by Dr. Kirkland to the New Unitarian Church in Philadelphia;" which, as we stated, they had "been complaisant enough to publish by shewing it to several of their orthodox friends." This statement we made on what we deemed good authority; and we believe any candid man would have so deemed it. But we now find, that the letter in question was not addressed formally to the Unitarian Church; but to "a zealous member" of the Socinian Society in Philadelphia; and that it may not have been published to the orthodox, any otherwise than by *relating its contents*. We have made diligent inquiry on the subject; and, after considering the extract in the note to the Layman's pamphlet, have no reason to doubt, that the letter of Dr. K. was substantially, though not formally, what we represented it; and that it was intended by the writer to promote the cause of Socinianism in Philadelphia.

"The story which the Reviewer tells," says Mr. Channing, "of a number of men assembling on the evening of Commencement, and putting together their observations on the President's prayer, sounds badly." We quote this passage for the sake of showing Mr. Channing himself, how easy it is to misrepresent; and to give an odious appearance to the most natural and innocent actions. We told no "story" of "a number of men assembling." We said, "several gentlemen of education and respectability, from different parts of the American union, came to the unanimous conclusion, &c." The fact was that some of these gentlemen were in one place, and some were in another; but they all came to the same "unanimous conclusion." Nor did those, who were in one place, "assemble," for the sake of "putting together their observations on the President's prayer," as Mr. Channing's language would intimate. The prayers of the President did, indeed, excite the astonishment of these gentlemen; and this astonishment they expressed to each other, as we suppose they had a right to do. Those of them, who were from distant parts of the country, had not before imagined, that such prayers were ever offered in a



Christian land; especially by a clergyman, who was at the head of a great literary institution. Mr. Channing, having added from his own invention the circumstance of "*assembling*," proceeds to make a very odious comparison, which implies the existence of several other odious circumstances; though for these insinuations there was not the slightest pretence. He concludes, by representing these gentlemen as "*spies*," because they had been so wicked as to observe and converse about the President's prayer; "*SPIES*," for listening to the prayers of Dr Kirkland, on commencement day, in the midst of two thousand people! We did not publish our account of these prayers without deliberation. We should despise any thing like a verbal criticism on public devotional services. We should equally despise the publication of strictures on the more private conduct of any gentleman, holding an important public office; because such conduct might receive a color, or appearance, from carelessness, inadvertence, occasional levity, or a thousand other causes. But we do not conceive ourselves to have infringed the rules of the most scrupulous decorum, in having adverted to the *general and peculiar character* of public services; which character must have been the result of a religious system, and could not be imputed to inadvertence, carelessness, or any temporary cause. We thought it a very solemn fact, that the general character of devotional exercises, on commencement day, in Harvard College, this favorite institution of our venerable forefathers, should be sunk down to the level of sober Deism. Others have thought it a solemn fact.

"There is another charge against the President of Harvard University," says Mr. Channing, "which no one certainly will expect me to notice; it is the charge of having written an article in the Anthology above four years ago. I am not in the habit of asking gentlemen, whether they are the authors of pieces which appear without a name; nor do I conceive that the President of Harvard University is bound to answer to the public, whenever an anonymous publication shall be laid to his charge."

This paragraph was written because Mr. Channing felt himself obliged to say *something*. Did Mr. Channing wish his readers to believe, that the President of Harvard College did not write the article in question? If he did wish his readers to believe so, we solemnly put the question to his conscience; Did *he* HIMSELF believe, what he wished to make others believe? If he did not wish his readers to believe so, why did he write the paragraph? Can any well informed man, who lives within fifty miles of Boston, doubt whether Mr. Channing was ignorant, who the writer of the article was?

Again; does Mr. C. wish to be understood, that the circumstance of the article having been written "*four years ago*" diminishes the criminality of having written it? Is there a statute of limitations, which can be pleaded at the bar of the Christian public, of conscience, and of God, in justification of any offence against religion, which may have been committed "*above four years ago*?" If there *is*, it will be a happy discovery for the whole race of scoffers; and there are many other articles in the Anthology, the authors of which will gladly take advantage of the statute.

Why did not Mr. Channing let the public know, whether he approved or condemned the passage, which we quoted from the article in the Anthology? If the passage was innocent, it must have been a small offence in us to have imputed it to any one; if the writing of the passage was a heinous offence, Mr. C. ought to have acknowledged it to be so, or not to have mentioned the subject at all.

The fact is, whatever Mr. Channing may say or think on the subject, that the article, which we quoted from the Anthology, made a very deep impression upon the Christian public. It cannot be winked out of sight. It cannot be excused or palliated. It is considered as one of the most pernicious, and one of the most culpable examples of scoffing at religion, which can any where be found; as holding up to ridicule all religious anxiety, all concern for the salvation of the soul; as deriding the holy joy of the penitent sinner, who casts himself upon the mercy of his Savior, and glories in the doctrines of the cross. Thus it is understood: and there are several other passages in the same article, which sustain the same unhappy character.

A gentleman of the liberal party informed a friend of ours, that he was present when the article was read in manuscript for the approbation of the conductors of the Anthology, at one of their weekly meetings. The writer was frequently interrupted, while reading the article, by peals of ungovernable laughter; so that it was not without difficulty that he was able to proceed. Mr. Channing appears to have a great sensibility to "*sneer*," "*insult*," and "*sarcasm*," in any case where he imagines these weapons to be directed against himself or his brethren. What does he think of several clergymen and laymen "*assembling*" by appointment; and one of the clergymen taking out of his pocket a string of sneers and sarcasms, written in the coolness and stillness of academic bowers;—of sneers and sarcasms, directed, not against the weaknesses or even the virtues of his fellow-men, but against *those great truths of religion*, which have been the consolation of the pious in every age? What does he think of such a string of sneers and sarcasms being read amidst a roar of laughter, and loud cheering, from every part of such a learned, liberal, clerical auditory? Is not this "*sitting in the seat of the scornful*?"

We designed to make a few observations on the effects of the present controversy; but we must crowd what we have to say on this subject into a single paragraph. We observe, then, that in the early part of the controversy there was a most uncommon exhibition of anger and indignation, throughout the whole extent of the liberal party. These wrath-

ful passions have been succeeded, in many instances, by deep and pathetic lamentations over the evils of controversy, and of separation. We have not heard whether any of the party suppose Mr. Channing to have the better of the argument. Possibly some of them do; we believe most of them do not. On the other side, the temper and the feelings have been very different. We have neither seen nor known any orthodox person angry, throughout the whole discussion. We have heard no fears, no anxiety, expressed among our friends, as to the result. They have been satisfied, that the cause of truth would be the gainer. They have been persuaded, that, in the language of Dr. Worcester, it is not a "violation of the great law of love, for the friends of truth to decline communion with its rejecters." Though we lament the unchristian feelings, the violent animosities, of which the controversy has been the occasion; we rejoice that the minds of men in this region, are awakened to consideration, and that the disclosures which have been made are so many and so important, as that the concealment of a minister's religious system will hereafter be difficult, if not impracticable.

## RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

### NATIONAL BIBLE SOCIETIES.

(Continued from page 88.)

#### *Russian National Bible Society.*

THE course of their Report having conducted your Committee towards the Russian Dominions, they will now advert to the transactions of this Society, in connexion with the North of Europe, beginning with the Bible Society at St. Petersburg, which has now assumed the title of "The Russian Bible Society." Of this Institution, formed under the immediate patronage of his Imperial Majesty, and superintended by a nobleman not less distinguished by his piety and abilities than by his high rank, it may be generally observed, that its proceedings are conducted with a zeal and energy which promise substantial benefits to the inhabitants of the widely extended Russian Empire. The great object to which its exertions are directed, is, to procure a large number of copies of the Holy Scriptures for distribution at the lowest rate; and for the accommodation of various classes, its Committee have ordered them to be printed in seven different languages, while the Committees of Auxiliary Societies in connexion with the Parent Institution at St. Petersburg, are printing them in several other dialects. The number of Bibles and Testaments now printing by the Russian Bible Society, is stated at 92,000 copies.

Among other works now in the course of execution by the Bible Society at St. Petersburg, your Committee point out to the particular notice of the General Meeting, the printing of the Persian Translation of the New Testament, by the late revered and lamented Henry Martyn. A copy of it was brought to St. Petersburg by his Excellency Sir Gore Ouseley, Bart. Ambassador Extraordinary from his Britannic Majesty to the Court of Persia, who has obligingly undertaken, during his continuance in Russia, to superintend the press.

The zeal, the learning, piety, and diligence of Mr. Martyn, afford the most satisfactory assurance of the accuracy of this Translation. That the diction is easy and simple, and the explanation of the sacred original clear and luminous, a singular testimony of rare authority, may be adduced from the interesting letter of Fateh Ali Shah Kajar, the King of Persia, to Sir Gore Ouseley, for the information of the British and Foreign Bible Society, copies of which have been generally circulated among the Members of the Institution. Under the countenance of this Sovereign, there is encouragement to hope, that the Persian New Testament will be extensively read; and as most of the western provinces of Persia are now subject to the Russian Authority, they afford a wide field for its circulation.

Various intelligence from the Crimea, received by the Committee of that Society, authorizes the pleasing expectation, that the circulation of the Tartar New Testament, printed at Karass, with the aid of the British and Foreign Bible Society, will prove a blessing to the Mohammedans in that quarter, where also a Turkish Edition of the Scriptures is much wanted. A Multi, whose title designates his connexion with the Musselman Priesthood, and to whom a Tartar New Testament had been presented, accepted it with exultation, and with many expressions of gratitude; he has become an annual Subscriber of fifty rubles to the Society at St. Petersburg, and has signified an anxious wish to become a Member of it. He has also expressed a solicitude to obtain a copy of the Bible in his own language, the Turkish.

Your Committee are proceeding with a version of the Calmuc New Testament; the translator of which residing at St. Petersburg, the Bible Society in that city has kindly undertaken to print it, at the charge of the British and Foreign Bible Society. As this dialect is likely to be understood by other Mongolian tribes in Siberia, and the confines of China, they look to the beneficial effects of this work with pleasing anticipations.



For much important information relative to the Græco-Georgian Church in Georgia, Imeretta, and Mingrellia, your Committee must refer to the communications of the Georgian Archbishop Dositheos, as stated in a letter from Mr. Pinkerton, which will appear in the Appendix. His Grace is a Member of the Russian Bible Society, and by his influence, the Royal Family of Georgia, and many of his countrymen, had also become Members of it.

The two following facts cannot fail to excite a deep and anxious interest :

That the number of professed Christians in the three provinces abovementioned, exceeds half a million; and

That in the 2000 churches which they contain, there are not 200 copies of the Bible.

The Members of the Society will therefore learn, with no small satisfaction, that not only an edition of the Georgian New Testament is printing at Moscow, as beforementioned, but that the Archbishop most heartily agreed to promote the establishment of a Georgian Bible Society on his arrival at Tiflis, the capital. They will also hear with pleasure his sentiments on the utility of the Bible Societies.

"It is my opinion, that the Bible Societies will be the means of spreading the knowledge of the Gospel among all nations, and of fulfilling the prophecies of our Lord in regard to this part of our faith. But such Institutions are not only most eminently calculated to bring the heathens to the faith of the Gospel, but also to rouse the churches of Christ, in different lands, from that spiritual ignorance and slumber in which many of them are lying, and to bring them again to the fountain of all truth and blessings."

As a token of his esteem for the British and Foreign Bible Society, he presented to them, through Mr. Pinkerton, a copy of a Georgian Bible, with an inscription, expressing his "sincere and hearty desire to co-operate with them in their exertions, pleasing to God, to spread the word of the Lord among all nations of the earth."

Your Committee have further to report, under this head, that the first Annual Meeting of the Russian Bible Society was held at St. Petersburg on the 20th of last September. On this solemn and interesting occasion, the first Dignitaries of the Greek, Catholic, Armenian, and Georgian Churches attended, in their sacerdotal garments, united in amity and peace.

The proceedings of the day were conducted by the universally beloved and respected President, Prince Galitzin. For particular details on this interesting subject, your Committee must refer to the Appendix. It is sufficient to state here, in the words of Mr. Pinkerton, "that the universal silence which prevailed while the Report of the Committee was reading, burst in mutual expressions of astonishment, gratitude, and joy, over the gloriously simple principles and blessed effects of their beneficent Institution."

The immediate effect of this Meeting was the accession of three Metropolitans, five Archbishops, and two distinguished Laymen, to the list of Vice-Presidents of the Society.

The total number of Auxiliary Bible Societies connected with the Parent Society at St. Petersburg, is now nine; two of which have lately been instituted at Woronesk, and Kaminesk, in the south of Russia, and others are in contemplation.

At a Meeting of the Committee of the St. Petersburg Society, subsequent to the General Meeting, the project for Bible Associations was considered and unanimously approved; and each Vice-President and Director had his district assigned to him, in order to carry the plan into effect.

Your Committee will conclude their Report respecting Russia, with the following quotation from a letter addressed to the Right Honorable the President, by his Excellency Prince Galitzin.

"The object of the Society is from day to day becoming more generally known and understood from its beneficent effects; its funds are increasing by the subscriptions and donations of many thousands of new Members and Benefactors. Thus our Institution is enabled, as it advances, to extend the sphere of its operations, and through the increasing aid which it receives from all classes of people in the Empire; among whom the Russian Clergy, by their own liberality and persuasion of others, are peculiarly distinguished. The peasantry in the villages lay together their rubles and kopecks, to support the good cause of the Society, thus manifesting, that they have right ideas of its pious work. The demand for Bibles increases from day to day so much, that the Society knows not how to satisfy it. Such, my Lord, are evident marks of the grace of God, that bringeth salvation to all men, and leadeth them, therefore, to the knowledge of the word of life."

Such a description cannot be heard without suggesting the most heartfelt prayers to God, for his blessing on an Institution formed for supplying the spiritual wants of the almost innumerable subjects of the Russian Empire; and in consideration of the vast and extensive field of operation, and the energy with which the Russian Bible Society continues to prosecute its object, your Committee have voted a third donation of 1000*l.* in aid of the general fund of that Institution.

#### *Swedish National Bible Society.*

Your Committee, having closed their Report respecting Russia, have now to solicit the attention of the General Meeting, to the proceedings in Sweden, in reference to the object of this Society. Of the activity displayed by the Evangelical Society at Stockholm, no further proof is necessary than that it has printed 40,600 Testaments, and 13,500 Bibles.

Your Committee have now to report, with feelings of unfeigned regret, an event which cannot fail to excite a general correspondent sympathy, the death of the Rev. Dr. Brunmark, in August, of last year. How strongly he felt the importance of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and how zealously he labored to promote the object of it, particularly in his native country, Sweden, where his loss has been most sincerely deplored, has been attested by abundant proofs. In truth, it may be said, that his life was a sacrifice to his indefatigable exertions in this cause. For, to quote the words of a correspondent, "while eagerly pressing on towards the summit of prayers and wishes, that the Bible Society in Sweden should furnish every man and woman in Sweden with the Holy Scriptures, he was regardless of his health, and undertook journeys far and wide, neither minding the severest cold, rain, or storm, so that he could arrive at his appointed place, to do the work of his heavenly Master."

In concert with the Reverend Secretary of the Evangelical Society at Stockholm, he formed the plan of a General Swedish Bible Society.\*

#### *Danish National Bible Society.*

The prospect in the neighboring kingdom of Denmark is not less promising than in Sweden.

The connexion of the British and Foreign Bible Society with the Danish Dominions, has been hitherto principally directed to partial efforts for supplying some of their poorer inhabitants, as well as the prisoners of war in Great Britain, with copies of the Holy Scriptures: they have now the satisfaction to report their hopes of a more intimate union and efficient co-operation for the circulation of them in that country.

On the 22d of May, 1814, a most respectable Meeting was convened in Copenhagen, at which the Right Rev. Dr. Munter, Bishop of Zealand, (a name which identifies the union of profound and extensive learning with genuine piety,) presided, when a proposal for establishing a Danish Bible Society was made and adopted. The resolution of the Meeting having been submitted in a Memorial to his Danish Majesty, he was pleased to express his approbation of it in the following terms, extracted from the Danish Gazette:

"With peculiar pleasure we learn, that the Right Rev. Doctor Munter, Bishop of Zealand, and several others, exert themselves to establish in our kingdom of Denmark a Bible Society, with a view of spreading religion, by distributing Bibles to the people, either gratis or for a moderate payment. We therefore do hereby grant to the said Society, under the name of 'the Bible Society,' in our kingdom of Denmark, our highest protection."

#### MISSIONARY NOTICE.

THE annual meeting of the MASSACHUSETTS MISSIONARY SOCIETY will be holden at the Vestry of Park-Street Church, Boston, on Tuesday, 28th May current, at 10 o'clock, A. M. On the evening of the same day, the Anniversary Sermon will be preached by the Rev. Mr. REYNOLDS, of Wilmington, and a collection for the benevolent objects of the Society will be made; exercises to commence at half past seven o'clock.

The TRUSTEES of the Society will meet on Monday the 27th, at 4 o'clock, P. M.  
May, 1816.

S. WORCESTER, Sec'y.

The Massachusetts Missionary Society has the honor of being one of the first Missionary Societies, instituted in this country since the new era of Missions commenced. It was formed as a voluntary association in 1799, and was incorporated in 1808. It is composed of ministers and lay members, residing chiefly in the Counties of Suffolk, Essex, Middlesex, Worcester, Norfolk, Plymouth, Bristol and Barnstable. "Any person may become a member by subscribing to the rules and regulations of the Society, and paying two dollars into the treasury;" and "every member is considered as retaining his membership, and as obliged to pay two dollars annually into the treasury, until his desire to discontinue his connexion be properly expressed to the Secretary." The present number of members is somewhat less than two hundred. Besides the annual payments of the members the funds of the Society have been made up, from year to year, of the public contributions of several congregations, of the collections made by Societies of Females, and by the donations and bequests of benevolent individuals. The annual receipts at the treasury, for several years past, have varied from about 1800 to about 2600 dollars. The ex-

\* Intelligence has been received since the Report was read, that the Swedish National Bible Society was formed at Stockholm, on the 26th of April, under the patronage of the King, and the Presidency of Baron Rosenblad, Minister for the Home Department. The Meeting was held in the largest room in Stockholm, and was most numerous and brilliantly attended. All the Bishops and Clergy from different parts of the kingdom who were attending the Diet were present, together with a numerous concourse of all ranks. The Crown Prince, who is the first Honorary Member, presented the Society with 6000 Rix-Dollars, and has further given a very handsome sum to encourage the formation of a Bible Society for the kingdom of Norway.



penditures for the support of Missionaries, and for the distribution of Bibles, Testaments, Psalm Books, Catechisms, and other religious books, have lately been greater than the receipts.

A large share of the labors and benefactions of this Society have been bestowed on the District of Maine, where the calls for them have been loud and urgent. But besides that necessitous and important District, the Missionaries of the Society have visited many destitute places in New-Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode-Island, New-York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, the Indiana, Missouri and Mississippi Territories, and Louisiana, preaching the Gospel of peace, and distributing the word of life; and of the Pagan tribes of our country, the Oneidas, the Senecas, the Wyandots, and the Narragansets, have shared in their attentions and labors. By their instrumentality many Churches have been formed in different and distant regions; Churches, which, it is devoutly to be hoped will long remain as lights in the world, and places of religious instruction, where the ordinances of the Gospel will be administered, and many an inquiring pilgrim will be directed to mount Zion. By the same instrumentality also, Bible Societies and other benevolent institutions have been established, from which extended and lasting benefits may be expected. And it claims particular and grateful notice, that these Missionary efforts have, in many instances, been manifestly accompanied by the powerful influences of the Holy Spirit; and many, there is good reason to believe,—many who were far from righteousness, have been brought to the saving knowledge of the truth, and made living witnesses for God and his great salvation to multitudes around them.

These brief statements are made in the way of appeal to the consciences and hearts of all who wish well to Zion, and to the best interests of their fellow beings. Is not the Massachusetts Missionary Society entitled to their Christian confidence, to their warm attention, to their generous aid? Fears have often indeed been expressed, probably from different motives, that other objects of charitable attention, and particularly that of Foreign Missions, would so engross the regards and liberalities of the Christian community as to occasion a neglect of the objects of this and similar societies, engaged especially for the support of missions in our own country. These fears, it is believed, are groundless. It is an incontrovertible fact, and a fact which ought to check all fears and jealousies and expressions of the kind now mentioned, that the supporters and friends of Foreign Missions are among the most zealous, and active, and liberal supporters and friends of missions at home. THE TRUE MISSIONARY SPIRIT IS ONE. It seeks the salvation of men and the advancement of the kingdom of the Redeemer, both at home and abroad; rejoices in all the efforts made for this great object, and in all the success which attends them; and will never indulge invidious comparisons or surmises, nor magnify the immediate objects or the operations of one benevolent Society to the disparagement of another. Let this spirit pervade the Christian community; let it be quickened and roused to the most zealous and persevering activity. There is no danger of its being too widely spread, or too highly excited. The calls for its exertions, its benefactions, and its prayers are heard from all quarters of the world. These importunate calls, and especially those from the necessitous parts of our own beloved country, must not be disregarded,—must not be heard in vain.—And as the anniversary of the Massachusetts Missionary Society is now approaching, it is devoutly to be hoped, that at this season especially, this Society will not be forgotten; but that ministers and others will be awake to its object; that many, who have hitherto neglected it, will be induced to become members; that public contributions and individual donations will be more extensive and more abundant than heretofore; that the members of the Society will give animation to the meeting by their general attendance; and that the blessing of heaven will descend upon them, and crown their efforts and their liberalities with extended and glorious success.

#### DONATIONS TO THE AMERICAN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS FOR FOREIGN MISSIONS, RECEIVED IN MARCH AND APRIL, 1816.

March 7. From a friend of Foreign Missions in Holden, (Mass.) by Mr. David J. Burr,	\$5 00
13. From the the Female Cent Society in Bridport, (Ver.) by the Rev. President Davis,	44 80
From do. do. do. in Shoreham,	22 12
From do. do. do. in Richmond,	16 10
From do. do. do. in St. Albans,	11 00
From Elisha Sheldon, Esq. of Sheldon,	20 00—114 02
15. From Mr. Timothy Downe, of Fitchburg, by Mr. D. J. Burr,	3 00
19. From the Religious Charitable Society in the County of Worcester, by the Rev. Joseph Goffe, the Treasurer,	20 00
22. From a friend of Foreign Missions, in Sanbornton, (N.H.) by the Rev. Abraham Bodwell, of that place,	5 00
23. From the Hon. Joshua Darling, of Henniker, (N. H.)	5 00

Carried forward, \$152 02

	Brought forward.	\$152 02
25.	From a young man in Orleans, (Mass.) by the Rev. D. Johnson,	10 00
27.	From Mr. Silas Parker, of the island of Newfoundland,	2 00
30.	From a gentleman, a small balance,	60
April 1.	From the Foreign Mission Society of Boston and the Vicinity,	394 55
	From Females in the South Parish of Weymouth, by Mrs. Sarah Pratt,	41 00
8.	From a Widow in ——— by Mr. David J. Burr,	3 36
9.	A new year's gift from a person in the County of Hampshire,	1 00
	From Mr. Thomas Thwing, of West Brookfield, by Mr. David J. Burr,	2 00
10.	From individuals in Brimfield, contributed at a social visit, and remitted by the Rev. Joseph Vaill,	8 00
	From Miss L. W. by the Rev. Mr. Huntington, for the translations,	2 00
16.	From Mrs. Jerusha Thurston, of St. Johnsbury, (Ver.) by the Rev. Dr. Spring,	1 10
	From Females in Haverhill, (Mass.) remitted by the Rev. Mr. Dodge to the Rev. Dr. Worcester,	3 00
	From a friend, by the Rev. Dr. Worcester,	5 00
	From the Salem Female Society for promoting the education of heathen children, their first quarterly payment, by Mrs. Abigail Needham, the Treasurer,	15 00
	From a female friend, for the heathen school fund, by the Rev. Dr. Worcester,	7 00
	From a female friend, for the same purpose, by the Rev. Dr. Morse,	2 00
23.	From the Aiding Foreign Mission Society of Plympton and the Vicinity, by the Rev. Elijah Dexter, the Treasurer,	36 81
	From Mrs. Osgood, of Andover north parish, by Mr. Henry Homes, of Boston,	3 00
27.	From Mr. Robert P. Williams, of Boston, for the translations,	3 00
29.	From M. E. and M. S. E. two little girls, for the School Fund,	2 00
	From Mr. Orin Fowler, of Fairfield, (Conn.) by David Judson, Esq.	2 00
		<hr/> \$696 44

## UNION ACADEMY.

We have been requested to publish a particular Statement of the Funds of Union Academy, and an address to the public in behalf of that institution. Our limits will not permit us to insert a full account of the donations; we have therefore compiled the following abstract:

## RECEIPTS.

July 14, 1813.	Donation, enclosed in an anonymous letter to Professor Moore	\$50 00
	From Mr. John Punchard, of Bath,	20 00
	From Mills Olcott, Esq.	150 00
	From Mr. Richard Lang,	150 00
	From sundry other persons during the year 1813,	53 90
Feb. 22, 1814.	From Mr. Henry Homes of Boston,	20 00
March 17.	From Mr. Solomon Goodell, Jamaica, (Ver.)	50 00
June 10.	From the Religious Charitable Society in the County of Worcester,	30 00
Sept. 22.	From the Female Charitable Society of Thetford, (Ver.)	29 54
Nov. 9.	From the Rev. B. Fowler, collected by him on a tour into the States of New York and Massachusetts,	541 20
	Amount of sundry donations during the year,	153 18
May 19, 1815.	Collections by the Rev. B. Fowler,	91 20
June 10.	From Mr. Henry Homes, Annual Subscription,	20 00
August 8.	From the Female Charitable Society in Thetford,	28 46
	Collected by the Rev. B. Fowler,	60 67
	From Mr. William Atwood, Pelham, (N. H.)	20 00
	Avails of sundry donations and collections during the year,	196 51
		<hr/> \$1,664 66

## EXPENDITURES.

June 12, 1813.	To Benjamin J. Gilbert, Esq. for expenses incurred in obtaining the Act of Incorporation,	\$13 82
	For sundries during the year 1814,	70 86
1815.	Sundries,	6 22
	For six Students under the patronage of the Trustees during the year, ending at Commencement, 1814,	244 00
	For nine Students under their patronage the year ending Commencement, 1815,	321 00
	For twelve Students under their patronage since Commencement last,	197 00
		<hr/> Total of Expenditures, \$852 90
		Receipts, 1,664 66

Balance in the Treasury at the disposal of the Board of Trustees, \$811 76



Donation of the Hon. Daniel Kimball for a permanent fund, the interest of which is appropriated towards paying the Preceptor, - \$6,000 00  
 A donation has been made of 1,000 acres of land in Lincoln, by Constant Murdock, Esq. and a right in Orange by the Rev. Mr. Waldo, for the use of the Academy.

## TO THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST AND THE FRIENDS OF THE GOSPEL IN NEW ENGLAND.

### BRETHREN AND FRIENDS,

You will perceive, by the above statement, that the funds of this institution are very inadequate to the object which it has in view. The proceeds of the *permanent* fund will be nearly all required for the support of the Principal of the Academy. The lands which have been given to the institution are in a state of nature, and will not probably produce any revenue for several years to come. A considerable part of the fund for *immediate expenditure*, or what is now in the treasury will be required for the expenses of the present year. The chief dependence of the institution for support, therefore, is on contributions, private donations, and individual subscriptions. A few of these are annual. But the sum thus raised is not large. It becomes then an interesting inquiry, What is to become of this institution, which has been established by so much pious effort, and watered by so many fervent prayers? Must the pious young men, who have been already taken under its patronage, be abandoned and driven to the necessity of resorting to other means of completing their education, or perhaps of relinquishing the object altogether? Must many others, who have made application or had their eyes turned to this institution for aid, be disappointed and discouraged in their hopes of getting an education for the sacred profession? Is it not highly important that they should be encouraged and enabled to accomplish their designs in this respect. Is there not a lamentable want of religious instructors in this country, and in almost every part of the world? especially of such as possess education and talents? It is a fact capable of the clearest proof, that about two-thirds of the people of the United States, are destitute of competent religious instructors. And this proportion must continue destitute, however desirous they may be of obtaining them, because they are not to be procured, and *cannot* be procured, unless the number of ministers can be increased. Yes, more than 5,000,000 of people in this Christian country, are constantly living and dying without the enjoyment of the usual means of grace; and, with respect to whom, it is out of their power in the ordinary way to have them. Of these about 180,000 on an average, die and go into eternity, every year, or nearly 500 every day—the great majority of whom, there is reason to believe, are totally unprepared for this solemn event; and of course, must go to take up their abode in the regions of everlasting woe. How affecting! how painful the thought! To remove this evil; in other words to supply the destitute in the U. States with competent religious instruction, would require an immediate increase of at least five thousand ministers. And is it not important that this supply should be furnished? Is it not immensely important to the *temporal interests* of the nation? What will become the state of public morals, if people are not to be furnished with the stated preaching of the Gospel? Or rather may we not ask what is the state of morals, in those sections of the country, where it has not been enjoyed for a considerable length of time? Do we not see ignorance, vice, vulgarity, fraud, contention, violence and crimes become prevalent? Is this a happy state of society?

What will become of our civil and literary institutions, without the support and influence of a well-educated clergy? Are they not universally the patrons and promoters of our schools, academies and colleges?

Are they not equally necessary to the support, stability and success of our government? Is it not a universally received maxim, that knowledge and virtue are the two main pillars on which a republican government must rest? But how long would these remain without the preaching of the Gospel and the labors of the clergy? And if they are important to any part of the community, they are important to every part of it. Is it not owing, in a great measure to the want of proper morals, and religious instruction, throughout this country that we have been so unhappily divided in political opinions, and that party spirit has raged, with so much violence, among us, for a few years past? Had every part of the United States been as well supplied with pious and learned religious instructors, as New England was, from its first settlement till the commencement of the revolutionary war, is there the least reason to believe, that political division and animosity would have prevailed to such an extent?

But if it is important to the *temporal* interests of the nation, that there should be an adequate supply of religious teachers, it is vastly, nay infinitely more important to their *spiritual* interests? This we cannot deny without being guilty of absolute infidelity. If we cannot be saved, without faith in Christ; and if "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," is it not important that the Gospel should be universally and faithfully preached? If it is important that it should be preached to any, is it not equally important that it should be preached to all? And do not facts abundantly prove, that the preaching of the Gospel is the great mean which God usually blesses to the salvation of mankind? Do

we not almost uniformly find, that where the Gospel is preached, in its purity and simplicity, reformations take place, churches are gathered, and the attention of people is turned to divine and eternal things. But where the Gospel is not preached, we see none of these happy effects, but people appear to be immersed in their business or pleasures; and have scarcely any more thoughts about their souls and a future state, than the beasts which perish.

It will be admitted, then, by all who wish well to Zion; it will be admitted by all candid and rational people, who have just views of what is necessary to the prosperity and happiness of a community, that it is important—*immensely important*—that this whole nation should be supplied, with a competent number of pious and well educated ministers of the Gospel. How is this supply to be furnished? Our colleges, in the ordinary course, do not furnish half enough to fill the vacancies which are annually made in the churches, without making any allowance for the rapid increase of our population. If the people were already supplied, at the rate of one minister for every one thousand souls, it would require, annually, about four hundred and seventy, or eight times as many ministers as are educated at all the colleges in the United States, to keep this number good; and about three hundred more, or upwards of five times as many as our colleges educate, to supply the annual increase of population. To look to our colleges then, for an adequate supply of religious teachers, is utterly vain. They cannot keep the present supply good. The disproportion between our population and the number of ministers, is every year increasing. At this rate, we are rapidly progressing towards a state of heathenism. Besides, how is the supply of five thousand ministers already needed, to be obtained? Some new measures must be adopted, or they never can be obtained. But in addition to this, a large number of well educated young men are wanted for missionaries, both for domestic and foreign missions.

What then is to be done? Shall our country be given up to vice, infidelity, and ruin, and the souls of our fellow-men to spiritual and eternal death, without making an effort to prevent it? Surely no one, who has a spark of Christian benevolence in his heart, will say this. Will any say that the facts which have been stated have a discouraging aspect? Is not this the plea of sloth or covetousness? When would the world have been converted from heathenism to Christianity, had the apostles and primitive Christians been discouraged, by the dismal prospects with which they were surrounded? When would the reformation from popery have been effected, if Luther and his coadjutors had fainted in view of the difficulties and dangers with which their undertaking was beset? And how little of what has been done towards spreading the Gospel, in modern times, would have been accomplished, had all the obstacles, which unbelief and avarice, and a love of ease and pleasure have attempted to throw in the way, discouraged the ardent missionary, from his undertaking. Let then the vast number of ministers who are necessary to supply the public exigency, if we may thus speak, only stimulate to greater exertions to provide them. And what means can be better adapted to the promotion of this end, than the support and establishment of institutions, designed to assist poor young men of piety and talents, in getting an education for the Gospel ministry? A number of such institutions have been commenced in this country within a few years past, which have received very considerable pecuniary aid. But still their means are very inadequate to their object. It is believed that all of them need greater funds, in order to accomplish their object, in the most successful manner. Certainly most of them do. This is peculiarly the case with *Union Academy*. There are now twenty young men, all of them, as far as we can judge, giving evidence of genuine piety and promising talents, who have been taken under the patronage of this institution, fourteen of whom are members of College. The remainder are at the academy, or in situations where they are prosecuting their studies, without much expense to the institution. But as soon as they enter college, which most of them are calculating to do, at the next commencement, they will need, and must have immediate assistance, or they cannot proceed. But the annual produce of the funds, aside from occasional donations and contributions, is not sufficient, besides paying the principal, to support more than six or seven students at college; and this only on the supposition of their keeping school three or four months, every year. It depends, therefore, entirely on the public liberality whether we shall be able to support these young men, and others who have applied for assistance, or whether they shall be left to the heartsickening task of endeavoring to get an education by their own exertions, or abandoning the object on which their hearts are so much set. This liberality, we trust, will be displayed. We have the fullest confidence that the friends of Zion will grant us their countenance and assistance in prosecuting so important an object—especially when they learn what is the deplorable situation of our country, as it respects the means of moral and religious instruction—that it is, by many degrees, more destitute of these, than any other Christian nation on the globe. We ask, then, the friends of Immanuel—the friends of the Gospel, to lend us their aid. We hope the rich will be disposed to “cast in of their abundance” into the treasury of the Lord. It is doubtful, in our opinion, whether there is any object, to which they can devote a share of their superfluous wealth, which promises more extensive utility than this. And we earnestly wish that those who have property to dispose of, by devise to charitable objects, would turn their thoughts to this institution. We hope that the Churches of Christ will help us by contributions, or by subscribing to give annually such sums as their



circumstances will justify. It is certain that they must do something of this kind, or they will, in a few years, be very generally destitute of pastors, and this nation, in a great measure, destitute of a Gospel ministry. And it is almost incredible how much they might do, if they were properly awakened to the importance of this subject.

The regular Churches in New-England contain, at the most moderate estimate, 40,000 members. Were they to contribute, annually, for this object, only fifty cents a member, the rich making up the deficiency of the poor, they would raise 20,000 dollars. This sum, according to the rate at which we have hitherto supported those whom we have had under our patronage, viz. with fifty dollars a year, would constantly maintain four hundred students at college. If the Churches would contribute at the rate of a dollar per each member, the number supported might be double. And if the other means which the community possesses, were brought into operation, the number might be doubled again. In this way, we might hope, other parts of the community making similar efforts, after the lapse of many years to have a competent supply of religious teachers.

We hope that the pious and benevolent females of our country will help us; particularly, that charitable and cent societies will turn the streams of their benevolence into this channel; as indeed, we are happy to acknowledge, several of them have already done. And we hope that many more such societies will be formed, for this express purpose.

Finally, let Christians act in a manner worthy of their holy profession. Whilst they profess to believe that it is more blessed to give than to receive, let them not in works deny it. Let them daily and fervently pray the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth more laborers into his harvest; but let them not be content to say, "be ye warmed and be ye clothed." Let their prayers and their offerings go hand in hand, that the one may witness the sincerity of the other. Let them beware of that covetousness which the Apostle pronounces a breach of the first commandment. Nothing more frequently brings reproach upon the cause of religion, than the discovery of this disposition in its professors.

We live in a peculiar day. Never, since the age of the apostles, have the friends of Zion been called on for the exercise of greater self-denial, or for more benevolent exertions, than they are at the present time; and, probably, in no future age will the same sacrifices and efforts be demanded of them. The world is now to be evangelized; and this is to be done by the charity and efforts of Christians. But as the *duties* of the present age are peculiar, so are its *privileges*. All who are willing to make the sacrifices and efforts demanded of them, will be found co-workers with God, in this glorious cause and will finally reap a reward proportionate to his exertions. Let not Christians, then, shrink from the labors and sacrifices, or undervalue the privileges in which they are invited to participate. If they do they may rest assured that God will carry on his cause by other instruments; but the honor and the happiness of co-operating in the blessed work of spreading the Gospel to the ends of the earth, which they despise, with all the glorious rewards which will follow, will be taken from them and given to others. And as life and opportunities are uncertain, as the road to perdition is thronged with travellers, and multitudes of souls are daily perishing for lack of vision, whatever any are disposed to do, let them do it quickly.

*In behalf of the Trustees,*

BANCROFT FOWLER, *Committee.*

## ORDINATIONS AND INSTALLATIONS.

ORDAINED, on the 8th November last, over the congregational church and society in Peru, the Rev. ROSWELL HAWKS. The Rev. Joseph Field made the introductory prayer; the Rev. Theophilus Packard preached the sermon; the Rev. Walter King made the consecrating prayer; the Rev. Theodore Hinsdale gave the charge; the Rev. John Leland addressed the people; the Rev. Jonathan Nash gave the right hand of fellowship; the Rev. Jonathan L. Pomeroy made the concluding prayer. The several parts of the religious performances, were appropriate and interesting. Previous to the ordination of the Rev. Mr. Hawks, the Rev. John Leland, at his own request and with the consent of the church and congregation, was dismissed, on account of age and infirmities, from his pastoral office. It is grateful to witness so great harmony and unanimity as were manifest on this occasion. *Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.*

Ordained on the 13th of March, over the first congregational church in Bloomfield, N. Y. the Rev. JULIUS STEELE. The Rev. Ezekiel J. Chapman made the introductory prayer; the Rev. Henry Axtell preached the sermon, from 2 Cor. ii, 15; the Rev. Mr. Hotchkiss made the consecrating prayer; the Rev. Ebenezer Fitch, D. D. gave the charge to the pastor; the Rev. Mr. Rawson gave the charge to the people; the Rev. Joseph Merrill presented the right hand of fellowship; and the Rev. Comfort Williams made the concluding prayer.

On the 25th of October last, the Rev. LUTHER HUMPHREY was installed as pastor over the church and society in Burton and Canton, Granger County, Ohio. The Rev. Jonathan Leslie made the introductory prayer; the Rev. William Hanford delivered the sermon, from 1 Tim. iv, 16; the Rev. Giles H. Cowles made the installing prayer; the Rev. John



Seward gave the charge to the candidate; the Rev. Joseph Badger gave the charge to the people; the Rev. Jonathan Leslie presented the right hand of fellowship; and the Rev. John Seward made the concluding prayer. The assembly was large, attentive and solemn. It is a favorable token for Zion, that many of the inhabitants in different parts of the state of Ohio, manifest a desire to enjoy the stated ordinances of the Gospel. There are yet many Societies destitute, and but few Missionaries to supply them.

On the 7th February last, the Rev. ISAAC JONES, to the pastoral care of the church and congregation in Candia (N. H.) The Rev. Mr. Kelly, of Hampstead, made the introductory prayer; the Rev. Asa M'Farland, D. D. of Concord, preached the sermon; the Rev. Mr. Carpenter, of Chichester, made the consecrating prayer; the Rev. Mr. Howe, of Hopkington, (Mass.) gave the charge; the Rev. Mr. Wells, of Deerfield, presented the right hand of fellowship; and the Rev. Mr. Prentice, of Northwood, made the concluding prayer. The public performances were very good, and highly interesting to a large and attentive assembly.

At Claverac, the Rev. RICHARD SLUYTER, colleague with the Rev. Mr. Gipland, over the Dutch Reformed Church there. The church was collected in 1767; but this was the first ordination in that place.

Installed in Cape Elizabeth, the Rev. WILLIAM GREGG.

### REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

THERE has been an unusual attention to religion in Philadelphia, during the latter part of the winter and the commencement of spring. The attention was first observed in the Rev. Mr. Patterson's congregation in the Northern Liberties. Meetings were held for prayer and exhortation every evening. The partition wall of two contiguous school-houses was taken down to accommodate the crowds of people who assembled. Many were under deep impressions; and a considerable number have been hopefully converted. Several young men, who attended the prayer-meetings out of curiosity, or for purposes of ridicule, became deeply impressed.

The doctrines, which have been blessed in producing this work, are the sovereignty of God, election, total depravity, unconditional submission, the necessity of regeneration, and of immediate faith in Christ, and holiness of heart and life.

A similar work of grace has been manifest in the second Presbyterian church, of which the Rev. Messrs. Janeway and Skinner are pastors.

The letter from which the following extract is taken, was written in Aug. 1815. The place mentioned is in the District of Maine, a few miles from Portsmouth, (N. H.)

"I think I mentioned to you the revival of religion at Elliot, about 13 or 14 miles from this place. It is a more interesting work than I have ever witnessed. Mr. C. reckons seventy-five as converts, and thirty or forty more under serious impressions. I preached there lately three times on the Sabbath, and on Monday morning at 9 o'clock, and had full, solemn, attentive assemblies, such as I never saw before. I thought it was evident, like the shining of the sun, that the same spirit was there, which was poured out on Pentecost. Twenty six heads of families have joined the church. This revival is the more remarkable, as it relates to the number of converts, because the town is small." "In a word, this is a new and strange thing, a marvellous thing in this region."

The following letter was addressed to the Editor of the Panoplist by the Rev. Frederic Marsh, pastor of the first church in Winchester, (Conn.) and is dated April 18, 1816.

"Dear Sir,  
I have observed, in the Panoplist for February, that notice is given of a revival of religion, in Salisbury, Winchester, and Colebrook, in this State. This notice contains but a part of what might be stated on this most interesting subject. I have waited to see some account of what God is doing in this region given by some of my fathers, or by some who have witnessed greater revivals, than that which has taken place among us. Knowing the deep interest which Christians every where take in hearing of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, I have determined to send you a few facts, which, if not better stated by some other hand, you are at liberty to dispose of as you shall judge most conducive to the interest of religion.

"It is now more than eighteen months, since the commencement of unusual seriousness and attention to religion, in the second society in this town, under the ministry of the Rev. James Beach. The work, however, was not such as to excite general attention till September last. Since that time, it has been great and general. It continues to be considerable yet. In the first society, where I am called to labor, there began to appear instances of special awakening, a year ago. During the summer, the attention of Christians was considerably excited, a spirit of prayer appeared to be given, and in the middle of autumn it was no longer doubtful that God had come by his Spirit to revive us again. During the last five months, it has been a time of refreshing from the presence of the Lord—a time of trembling anxiety and joy. There is still much and solemn attention to religious meetings and instruction. If it be proper to speak of numbers that have expressed hopes of saving conversion, to speak moderately, we may name forty five or fifty. The work has no



however been as great, by considerable, in this as in the second society. Concerning the work in these two societies, I can state confidently, that the subjects of it have generally had a clear and strong conviction of the entire sinfulness of their hearts by nature, and of the absolute necessity of the special grace of God to bring them to repentance. In many ways has God shown that the work was his own. His hand has been most apparent.

"In Salisbury, the revival of religion has been more extensive and powerful, has affected a greater number, than in any other place in this vicinity; yet, it is believed to be true, that, considering the time during which the revival continued conspicuous, no place has witnessed more signal displays of the power and grace of God in the conviction and conversion of sinners, than Colebrook. For many months, Norfolk also has been visited in a manner which shows how easy it is for the Spirit of Jesus to deliver sinners from the power of darkness and translate them into the kingdom of his grace. In March, forty five were added to the church in that place, at one time. It is with peculiar satisfaction and joy that I can now state, that revivals of religion have recently commenced in New Hartford, Canton, and Torrington. They have not yet become general, but are evidently increasing. Of this I received information yesterday, from the ministers of those places.

"But this is not all. Besides the eight places which I have before mentioned, four other societies in this Association, (Litchfield North,) have been visited with special divine influence during the year past. In some of these, the revival has been considerably extensive. I cannot state particulars. Thus, 12 of 19 societies in this Association have received special tokens of the presence of God in the effusion of his Holy Spirit.—

The pious people in this vicinity, for seventeen years, have looked upon the years 1798 and 9, as a kind of *era* in the religious history of these churches. But we have now a new era. It is believed, that in no single period of their history have they been visited with so many, so extensive, and so powerful revivals of religion, as they have witnessed during the year past."

The following letter was written for publication, by the Rev. Jonathan Grout, pastor of the church in Hawley, (Mass.) and is dated May 6, 1816.

"Sir,

If you think the following intelligence of awakenings in this vicinity will be gratifying to the readers of the Panoplist, you are at liberty to publish it.

"God was pleased to pour out his Spirit in this town and to awaken some to a concern for their spiritual interest about a year since. The religious attention continued in a greater or less degree during the summer and autumn; in the winter, it seemed gradually to increase. This spring we have been blessed with a most remarkable shower of divine grace. About forty, perhaps upwards, in the space of one week were hopefully brought to bow to the King of Zion. It is difficult in this stage of the work to give that accurate description of it, which may hereafter be done should God afford the opportunity. At present I can only state, that the work still continues with a considerable degree of power; that the number who have hopefully embraced religion, in the opinion of those, who have had the best advantage to gain information on the subject, is not less than one hundred and eighty in this small town. Fifty three were yesterday received to our communion. God is likewise shedding down the influences of his Holy Spirit upon other towns in this vicinity; in the towns of Plainfield and Goshen in Hampshire County. In Ashfield, Conway, Whately, and Sunderland, in the County of Franklin, the work of grace has more recently commenced, but is considerably powerful. Thus, with the return of peace to our country, the Prince of peace seems wonderfully to display his power and grace for the enlargement of that kingdom, that consists not in meat and drink, but in righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

#### THE FEMALE BIBLE SOCIETY OF BOSTON AND ITS VICINITY

HELD its annual meeting on the 27th of March last, when it appeared that the number of Bibles and Testaments distributed by the Society was 555. The receipts of the Society, during the last year, amounted to somewhat more than \$300. The annual report closes with the following paragraphs:

"The influence of Divine Truth is commonly like the 'still small voice' spoken of by the Prophet. We are not therefore to expect immediate and splendid effects from our exertions. It is sufficient for us, that the Bible has always proved the most effectual barrier against vice, in every form—that it has always softened the rugged, and reformed the vicious heart of man, where its influence has not been perverted by the most persevering obstinacy. But the Christian must feel, that the Bible is a blessing whose magnitude can never be fully estimated in this world—he must feel (viewing the subject in its awful connexion with eternity,) that the value of that word which brings life and immortality to light—which teaches immortal man the way to Heaven, is great beyond conception. Who that has seen the preciousness of Divine Truth—that has experienced its consolations when human comforts have been desolated by afflictions, or has heard its unerring voice cry, 'this is the way,' when bewildered in the labyrinths of doubt and error—who that has discovered the sweetness of its promises, the safety of its rest, and the



purity of the motives and rewards which it presents to men; can view without strong emotion the progress which it is making in the world? A few years since, and to the Savage of our Western wilderness, and the indigent Stranger in our Southern borders, were alike inaccessible those waters of life, which are given for the healing of the nations—now, to both is opened that living fountain, of which if a man taste he shall live forever.

“Nor is the prospect less animating when we cast our eyes abroad, and contemplate the wonders which have been effected by our Christian brethren on the other side of the Atlantic. We there behold those vast but inauspicious regions of Europe and India, which have so long experienced the most deplorable moral, and perhaps intellectual degradation, now gradually receiving the impress of humanity and of Heaven, under the imperceptible, but transforming influence of the Bible. We behold the superstitious Persian, and the sensual Mohammedan, the cheerless inhabitant of Siberia, and the cruel native of Hindostan, stretching out their hands to receive this best gift of Heaven. And do we believe that “the law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; that the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes;” do we think with the Psalmist, that this law is “more to be desired than gold, yea than much fine gold;” and shall not our hearts glow with fervent desires to contribute by our prayers, as well as in every other possible way, toward its universal diffusion and success? Ah! can we forget to remember before Him, who alone can make even His own word effectual to salvation, our brethren of the human family, who are groping in the hopeless, helpless darkness of Heathenism, annihilating the tenderest sympathies of our nature, and sacrificing even the babes of their bosoms to appease the anger of their imaginary Deities? Forget them! where then is our zeal for human happiness; where our boasted compassion for the wretched; where our christian sensibilities? But blessed be God! the spirit of supineness, which has for centuries cruelly abandoned the heathen, in their own and other countries, to their miserable destiny, is fast vanishing away. The Christian world has awakened from that strange slumber, which so long closed its eyes to the situation, and wants, of those who were sitting in the region of darkness and shadow of death, and is wondering that it slept so long. The work of the Lord is rapidly going on. Who would sit idle, when all nature seems as it were to be travailing in birth and waiting for the redemption of Zion? Who would not esteem it a privilege, of no ordinary importance, to be permitted to lend his assistance in that cause which is dear to God, the cause of virtue, the cause of Christ?

“And let us never be *weary* in well doing; let us never be discouraged at not so soon beholding the fruits of our efforts as we have expected—that Bible we bestowed, that prayer we offered, may, even in a future day, be made the instrument of saving a soul, nay, many souls from death; and of accumulating an additional weight of blessedness for ourselves in the heavenly world. “They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever.”

#### AMERICAN MISSIONARIES.

WE regret to state, that intelligence was received in April, that Mr. Nott and his family, had been obliged to leave Bombay for America, on account of the illness of Mr. Nott. He did not resort to this measure till his medical advisers were of opinion, that he could never hope to enjoy good health in that climate. A letter was written by Mr. N. to a friend in Boston, dated at sea, within a week's sail of London, Feb. 15th. His health had been improved by the voyage. He is probably now on his way from England to America.

Letters have come to hand from Messrs. Newell and Hall; but they sent their journals, and full details concerning the mission, by Mr. Nott. Of course these journals have not been received. In this letter to Dr. Worcester, Messrs. Hall and Newell say, “You will have seen from our previous letters how anxious we were, even before our little number was thus diminished, to have more Missionaries join us. You will expect us to be much more anxious now. We certainly are. In point of numbers, we two Missionaries are to Bombay, (to say nothing of the millions in sight of Bombay,) what two ministers would be to the whole population of Connecticut, were the people of that State all heathens, and those two ministers far removed from all ministerial intercourse and Christian counsel.”

*From the Newark Centinel.*

A LETTER FROM THE REV. SAMUEL NEWELL, MISSIONARY TO INDIA, TO THE REV. EDWARD D. GRIFFIN, D. D. DATED

*Bombay, June 11, 1815.*

DEAR SIR—By the present opportunity I send to Dr. Worcester my journal, which contains the history of all my wanderings and afflictions from my arrival in India till I came to Bombay. I have requested Dr. W. to let you see it. This will supply the place of many letters. You will also learn, from our communications to the Board, from time to time, the history of our Mission, and its present state. We have been carried through



a series of afflictions, painful and distressing in the extreme, and have often been ready to say, "The mercies of God are clean gone, and the Lord will be favorable no more." But we can now sing of the goodness and faithfulness of God, and say, "Hitherto the Lord hath helped us." We are now permanently established in this important place, and have, through divine goodness, made so much progress in the language as to be able, though with stammering lips, to preach the *good news* to a people to whom Christ was before unknown. Mr. Hall and myself are the only Protestant Missionaries on this side of India, except an Armenian Brother at Surat, in connexion with the Serampore Mission. The Mahratta language, which we are learning, is the language of many millions of people in this region. There are *two hundred thousand* in Bombay alone. When we look at the multitudes of heathen around us, who are daily dropping in long and rapid succession into the eternal pit, ignorant of what awaits them beyond the grave, we are compelled to take up a lamentation and say, "O thou slaughtered Lamb of God, why was thy blood shed in vain! Why perish these countless millions of immortal souls for whom thou hast endured the pains of death." O my dear Sir, who will be answerable for this waste, (if I may so speak,) of redeeming blood? Why do whole nations thus go down to hell from generation to generation? It is only because the *Church* and the *Ministers* of Christ will not obey his *last and emphatic* command, "to teach all nations." Is not this strange? To what can we attribute this known, wilful, and persevering disobedience to the last, authoritative command of the King of Zion? Did not he who said, "Thou shalt not kill," say in as positive a manner, "Go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature?" And is not the breach of the latter command as ruinous in its consequences as the violation of the former? May we not say to the Christian, though thou commit no murder, yet if thou disobey the Savior's last command, then, through thy disobedience, shall thy heathen brother perish, for whom Christ died? When we stand at the distance of fifteen thousand miles, and look at six hundred millions of heathens in Asia in one mass, only a general and comparatively faint impression is made on the mind; but standing, as we now do, in the *midst* of the heathen, and *seeing* them groping in thick darkness, bewildered in the mazes of the most absurd and shocking fictions that the depraved mind of man could invent, wedded to their idols and enslaved to vice; *when* we see, as we sometimes have seen, a hundred thousand of our fellow-creatures at once dancing and shouting around the bloody car of Juggernaut, and prostrating themselves before that hateful demon; *when* we actually behold all the nameless ingredients that go to make up that mass of corruption, guilt, and shame, comprised in *idolatry*:—O! it is enough to awaken, in the heart that can feel for the wretchedness of fallen man, every emotion of pity, indignation, grief, and burning zeal. We are sadly deficient in zeal and in duty; but when we look on these heathen, and see how they live, and how they die, and consider how long it has been thus—we sometimes wish we could raise our voices to such a pitch, that they might reach beyond the intervening oceans and continents; and enter into the ears of our brethren and fathers in America. My dear Sir, let me engage you to speak in our behalf, and plead in our stead the Missionary cause before the Churches.\* They have sent us forth, a little feeble band, to encounter a great host; we have been scattered abroad, and our little number has already been considerably reduced. Will the Churches that sent us forth now leave us to prosecute the work alone? We look to them for support in the arduous conflict in which we are engaged. Unless they fill up our ranks which have been broken in the first onset; unless they send forth **A GREAT MANY MORE**, and determine to prosecute the work with vigor and perseverance, the lives and the treasure which they have already bestowed on the object will be thrown away. Where are the numerous converts that have lately been gathered into the Churches in the late revivals in different parts of the land? They have enlisted under the banners of the cross; do they not burn with zeal to join the Captain of their salvation, and attend his triumphant march, while he goes through the earth conquering and to conquer? Shall we not soon greet some of them as fellow-laborers in this part of the vineyard? Shall we not see others going to strengthen, and support, and encourage our dear solitary brother Judson, at Rangoon; and others going in different directions to form new stations? But I must stop. Dear Sir, let me entreat you again to plead the Missionary cause before the Churches, and to call on them by the commission they gave us to preach Christ to the Gentiles,—by the right hand of fellowship which they gave us when they sent us forth,—by all the afflictions and trials which we have suffered in the prosecution of our work,—by the love of Christ and the souls of the heathen, entreat them not to leave us to this great work alone. Let them send forth *more Missionaries*, and still **MORE**, and never think they have done enough, until the kingdom of GOD shall come, and his will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

\*For years past it has been usual for some of the *Ministers* who are the most active supporters of the London Missionary Society, to travel through the Island to preach *Missionary Sermons*, and to make collections in favor of *Missionary objects*. Would not something of this kind be proper in this country? Ought not the attention of the religious public, from the Northern to the Southern limits of the States, to be called to the great subject of *Missions*, and their aid earnestly solicited?—[Cent. Ed.]



## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Mr. J. E. Worcester, of Salem, has issued proposals for publishing a *Universal Dictionary of Geography, Ancient and Modern*; founded, so far as it respects the modern geography of the eastern continent, upon Crutwell's Gazetteer, with additions and corrections. On the subject of *ancient* geography, the work of D. Anville will be made the principal basis. With respect to *America*, materials will be collected from a great variety of sources; and the work is proposed to be far more complete with regard to this continent, than any that has yet been published. It is intended to comprise, in one large volume, and in one alphabetical series, more than *four times as many articles of Geography*, as are to be found in the Gazetteers which have been published in America.—The design is to reduce the various materials to the narrowest compass possible; and to specify, respecting every article, those particulars for which a Gazetteer is usually consulted.

## NEW WORKS.

**THE Character of Nehemiah, or Jerusalem built up: A Sermon, preached on the public fast, April 4, 1816, in the Chapel of the Theological Seminary at Andover.** By Ebenezer Porter, D. D. Bartlet Professor of Sacred Rhetoric in the Seminary. Andover: Fagg and Gould.

**Travels in South Africa, undertaken at the request of the Missionary Society.** By John Campbell, minister of Kingsland Chapel. Andover: Fagg and Gould. 1816. pp. 398. 8vo.

## SCOTT'S FAMILY BIBLE.

Another volume of Armstrong's edition of Scott's Family Bible will be ready in a few days. This volume contains the Books of the Old Testament as far as Joshua inclusive. The whole work is in rapid progress. Price remains the same as it was originally, \$3 00 in neat boards; or \$3 50 bound and lettered;—but the price will be raised.

A new edition of Dr. Worcester's Christian Psalmody is proposed in a cheaper form. Price 75 cents. Subscription papers can be had of the publisher, Samuel T. Armstrong.

## OBITUARY.

At Columbia, (S. C.) the Hon. NATHAN HUGGINS, a Senator in the legislature of that State.

In Maryland, Mr. JACOB FISHER, aged 69. He was carelessly running along, with his hands in his pockets, tripped, struck his breast against a curb stone, and died immediately.

In Virginia, Dec. 8th, Mr. JOHN CORBIN, aged 20, son of Major Richard Corbin, in consequence of a wound received the preceding day in a duel with a fellow-student of Carlisle College.

At Trenton, (N. J.) the Rev. JAMES F. ARMSTRONG, aged 58.

At Montville, (Conn.) the Hon. WILLIAM HILLHOUSE, aged 88. He was in the Connecticut Legislature more than 50 years in succession.

In Virginia, Major JOHN REID, of the U. S. army; the well-known aid, and contemplated biographer of General Jackson.

At Exeter, (N. H.) the Hon. SAMUEL TENNEY, M. D. formerly a Senator in Congress.

In England, Mr. EDWARD POST, (eldest son of Professor Post,) Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, London, and late Lecturer on Anatomy in the University of New-York.

At Andover, (Mass.) Mrs. SARAH ABBOT, widow of the late Samuel Abbot, Esq.

At Seabrook, (N. H.) COMFORT COLLINS, aged *One Hundred and five years and three months*, having officiated many years as a minister in the Society of Friends.

At Rehoboth, the Hon. STEPHEN BULLOCK, in the 81st year of his age. He was a member of the Convention which framed and adopted the Constitution of Massachusetts; and from that time without intermission a Representative to the General Court, until he was chosen a Representative to the Congress of the United States, in 1797. He was for several years a Judge of



the Court of Common Pleas for the county of Bristol, and a Senator from that county in the Legislature; and afterwards, for a number of years, a member of the Executive Council of the State, until his retirement from all public business in 1810.

At Groton, (Conn.) Miss CHAPEL, aged 18, of that dreadful disease, the hydrophobia. Several children were bitten by the dog, whose bite occasioned the death of this young woman.

DIED, at Marlborough, on the 21st of March last, very much lamented, Miss ELISABETH WARREN, aged 27, daughter of Mr. Thaddeus Warren, and sister of the Rev. Edward Warren, Missionary to the East. In the death of this amiable female, society has been stripped of a truly valuable member, and the church of Christ, with which she had for seven years been united, of one of its brightest ornaments. Though nature had endued her with a heart formed for friendship, with affability of manners, and a sweetness of disposition rarely to be found; yet it was *grace* which shed such resplendent lustre over her character, and sanctified the whole. Glowing with ardent love to the Savior, and the souls for whom he died, all her influence and example were united to promote the spread of the Gospel, and the extension of the Redeemer's kingdom. Seven successive summers she was employed with much acceptance, as a school instructress. Deeply sensible how important it is, that the rising generation be favored with religious instruction, great were her exertions to infuse a spirit of piety into their tender minds. To her it was a delightful task to raise their thoughts to God, and teach them the road which leads to Heaven. Not only did she pour daily pious instructions into their opening minds, but, during the last season, morning and evening, she presented herself with them before the mercy seat, and supplicated their heavenly Father's blessing. Ye females, to whom is intrusted the education of children, here is a worthy example. Shall it not animate you to a faithful discharge of duty? Shall it not excite in you a spirit of emulation? If you love your Lord, O feed the lambs of his flock; and follow her, as she followed Christ.

As the subject of these remarks lived the life, so she died the death, of the righteous. During the consumptive illness which terminated her earthly existence, she might with propriety be styled a pattern of patience. Acquiescence and peace ever sat smiling on her brow, and never did a feeling seem to pervade her mind whose language was not, *Thy will be done*. Death was disarmed of his terrors, and, even in the agonies of dissolving nature, she could look forward, with joyful hope, to those scenes which awaited her beyond the grave. She gave her friends a parting blessing, and a parting kiss; and, then, in the triumphs of faith, she committed her departing spirit to the faithful hand of Jesus. United by ten thousand tender ties to a numerous circle of relatives and friends, painful indeed has been the stroke which has severed her from their society. But while the tears of bereaved affection flow, the indubitable evidence, that she has found her wished-for, long-sought home, gladdens their hearts. *Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord. Yea, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labors; and their works do follow them.*

At Princeton, (Mass.) Feb. 28, Mrs. HARRIET BULLOCK, wife of Mr. Calvin Bullock, aged 27. Dedicated to God in her infancy, she early took upon herself the bonds of the covenant, and uniformly exhibited all the lovely graces of the humble Christian.— Ardent love to God and his cause, a conscientious regard to the duties of life, faithfulness in friendship, humility in prosperity, and exemplary patience in adversity, were excellencies in her, heightened by the engaging modesty of her deportment; and which, with a joyful trust and unshaken confidence in God her Savior, in the near prospect of death, gave evidence, not only of the sincerity of her profession, but of the advantages of early piety.

At Northborough, very suddenly, the Rev. PETER WHITNEY, pastor of the church in that town.

At Ashby, Dea. ISAAC GREGORY, aged 81 years.

In New York, the Right Rev. BENJAMIN MOORE, D. D.

At New Milford, Mr. ASA NICHOLS, killed by being caught by a wheel of a gristmill.

At Danbury, (Conn.) by suicide, Mrs. JERUSHA BARNHAM, aged 24 years.

At Pittsfield, (Mass.) DANIEL C. NORTON, aged 12 years. A team passed over his body, which occasioned his death in two hours.

At Providence, Mr. GEORGE W. HAMMOND, aged 57, drowned in a pond.

In Spartansburg, Co. (S. C.) the Rev. Avery Williams, late pastor of the church in Lexington, (Mass.)

In North-Carolina, Benjamin Lawson, son of Gen. Lawson, of Amelia, (suicide,) by hanging himself in a wood, when on a journey from Savannah to Virginia.

In Spartansburg District, (S. C.) Mrs Sarah Pemry, aged *One hundred and three years seven months and fourteen days*.

At his Seat in Westmoreland County, (Vir.) Hon. WALTER JONES, aged 76, for many years a member of Congress.

At Danbury, (Con.) Hon. JOSEPH PLATT COOKE, aged 86, formerly a member of Congress; he was graduated at Yale College in the year 1750.

In Maryland, Mr. WILLIAM ROESE, aged 108 years and 17 days.

At Wendell, the Rev. JOSEPH KILBURN, aged 61.

At Wellington, (Vir.) Widow Eunice Bangs, aged *One Hundred and five years*.

At Danvers, Hon. SAMUEL HOLTEN, aged 77; he was president of the Provincial Congress during the American War.

At Philadelphia, Dr. BENJAMIN SMITH BARTON, one of the professors in the medical College at that place.

At his Seat in Pittsylvania County, (Vir.) Hon. MATTHEW CLAY, member elect of the present Congress.

The following remarkable account of mortality among the *aged* in the town of New Ipswich, (N. H.) will be read with deep interest by all who are in the habit of reflecting on the solemn hour of death. It must be considered, that without any prevailing sickness it has been so ordered in providence, that within one year, ending April 1st. 1816, more than one half of those who were 70 years old and upwards, and commenced the year in health, have been called to the silent grave. Husband and wife, who had lived together 40 or 50 years, were separated by death—but for a few days or weeks, when called to meet again, if they were Christ's, in their Father's house not made with hands eternal in the heavens. Some of them were among the first settlers of the town, and formed a part of the first church, and by their exemplary lives and triumphant deaths, have left a solemn lesson for the living to imitate their virtues and follow their examples, as far as they followed Christ.

May 2, 1815, Mrs. — Adams, wife of Dea. Benjamin Adams, aged	75.
May 5, Dea. Benjamin Adams,	86.
Nov. 7, 1815, Mrs. Elizabeth, wife of Francis Appleton	85.
Jan. 29, 1816, Mr. Francis Appleton,	83.
Dec. 4, 1815, Mrs. Abigail, wife of David Hills,	72.
Dec. 18, Mr. David Hills,	79.
Dec. 21, 1815, Mrs. — Mansfield, wife of Daniel Mansfield,	70.
March 29, 1816, Mr. Daniel Mansfield,	74.
Feb. 4, 1816 Lieut. John Pratt,	68.
Feb. 7, Mrs. Pratt, wife of John Pratt,	74.
March 7, 1816, Mrs. Judith, wife of Thomas Emerson,	71.
March 27, Mr. Thomas Emerson,	75.
April 15, 1815, Mr. Jonas Wheeler,	95.
May 5, Widow Rachel Kidder,	92.
Aug. 2, Capt. Eleazer Cummings,	76.
Sept. 28, Mrs. — Wilkins, wife of Jonathan Wilkins,	72.
Nov. 23, Mr. Thomas Spaulding,	83.

## POETRY.

### THE FLOWER.

AGAIN distils the vernal shower,  
And softer zephyrs rise:  
In embryo sleeps the coming flower  
Nor trusts uncertain skies.  
But soon a more reviving ray,  
Shall pierce the slumberer's cell;  
Then, all at once to genial day,  
Her little glories swell.  
One night she drinks ambrosial dews  
And breathes of Paradise;  
One day in fancy-tinctured hues,  
She spreads her gay device.  
Then comes the fury of the blast,  
Or more resistless flood,  
Inglorious ruins mark the waste,  
Where erst the floweret stood.

So hope unfolds her tender germ;  
Pleasure, her roseate bloom;  
Death is that furious flood or storm,  
That waste the silent tomb.

There is a plant that meets the gale,  
And all its force defies;  
Nor heeds the tempest's angry swell:  
Love, never, never dies.  
Transferr'd to a more genial clime,  
Where gentler currents run;  
Beyond the reach of rolling time,  
Beneath a clearer sun;  
Bright as the morning's dewy ray,  
It gilds its high abode;  
Eternal as the heavenly day,  
Or stable throne of God.

AMERICANS.

### TO READERS.

We have inserted half a sheet more than usual in this number; and shall insert half a sheet less in the next.

In the list of *donations to Foreign Missions*, published in our number for February, the sum of \$9 82, stated to have been contributed in Northford, was contributed in the First Society of Branford, and appropriated to the *translations*.